

By Mrs. BOSONE:

H. R. 2052. A bill to provide for the eradication and control of poisonous weeds, especially Halogeton glomeratus, on range and pasture lands in the several States and Territories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2053. A bill to waive the charge for migratory-bird hunting stamps sold to members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2054. A bill to amend the Selective Service Act of 1948 to require that at least one member of each local board and each appeal board shall be a veteran; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 2055. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the vicinity of Los Angeles in the State of California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD:

H. R. 2056. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 2057. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 2058. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 2059. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 2060. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 2061. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 2062. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 2063. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. J. Res. 128. Joint resolution providing for a revision of the regulations relating to the deferment from service in the Armed Forces of persons employed in agriculture, so as to assure essential production of food; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. J. Res. 129. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1951, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig.

Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. J. Res. 130. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualifications of electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 131. Joint resolution to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RILEY:

H. J. Res. 132. Joint resolution relating to peanut acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. Con. Res. 45. Concurrent resolution to favor a Pacific Pact and United States participation therein; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. Con. Res. 46. Concurrent resolution for the establishment of a United Nations Police Authority; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. Con. Res. 47. Concurrent resolution to favor a Pacific Pact and United States participation therein; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 94. Resolution authorizing printing of the History of the Committee on the Judiciary as a House document; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 95. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. Res. 96. Resolution opposing the admission of Communist China to membership in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. Res. 97. Resolution to amend paragraph (2) (c) of rule XI of the House (relating to the Committee on Rules); to the Committee on Rules.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relating to the central Arizona project; to the Committee on Public Lands.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 2064. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ihor Sevcenko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 2065. A bill for the relief of the Lacchi Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

H. R. 2066. A bill for the relief of Ralph Dunsmore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

H. R. 2067. A bill for the relief of Vesther W. Ash; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 2068. A bill for the relief of Sook Kat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2069. A bill for the relief of the Reverend Daisuke Kitagawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H. R. 2070. A bill for the relief of Thomas Clayton Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCGUIRE:

H. R. 2071. A bill for the relief of Gerhard H. A. Anton Bebr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 2072. A bill for the relief of Jeremiah Coleman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 2073. A bill for the relief of Maj. Thomas H. Campbell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 2074. A bill for the relief of Sister Concezione-Eleanora Sudano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 2075. A bill for the relief of the A. C. Israel Commodity Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 2076. A bill for the relief of Mr. Carlo Bardella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2077. A bill for the relief of Basile Carras and Calliope Carras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2078. A bill to provide for the sale of certain land in Kern County, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. R. 2079. A bill for the relief of Aleksander Kupiszewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2080. A bill for the relief of Ardes Albacete Yanez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

22. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of seven members of the Union Presbyterian Church, of Cannelton, Pa., urging that the serving and selling of alcoholic liquors and alcoholic beverages to service men and women be discontinued; to the Committee on Armed Services.

23. Also, petition of 13 members of the Mount Pleasant Presbyterian Church, of Darlington, Pa., urging that the serving and selling of alcoholic liquors and alcoholic beverages to service men and women be discontinued; to the Committee on Armed Services.

24. By Mr. MARSHALL: Petition of Mrs. Florence Shutter and others, of Burtrum and Swanville, Minn., protesting universal military training or lowering age of induction if alcoholic beverages are sold on or near military posts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 25, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, January 8, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Isaac Steenson, minister, Clarendon Presbyterian Church, Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

Grant, O God, that those who are to bear the burden of high responsibility in this place this day may draw strength from these moments of prayer. Thou art reaching out to help them; may they reach out to Thee to be helped.

May Thy servants here never allow themselves to become common when they are called upon to deal with common things, but may there be about them a quiet dignity and sincerity that shall command respect everywhere, and that shall be more persuasive than a multitude of words.

May the voice that speaks from this place convey the accents of a higher voice than ours, that the other peoples of the world may see that our upreach is as much a part of our lives as our outreach. In the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 23, 1951, was dispensed with.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1. An act to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1724. An act to provide for the renegotiation of contracts, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1726. An act to provide for the organization of the Air Force and the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 87. Joint resolution amending section 5012 of the Internal Revenue Code.

#### LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] be permitted to be absent from the sessions of the Senate next week in order that he may represent this Nation in connection with the inauguration of the President of Brazil.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KEFAUVER, because of official business, was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of this week.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HICKENLOOPER was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate during next week on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. GEORGE, and by unanimous consent, the Finance Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate this afternoon for hearings on veterans' bills.

On request of Mr. RUSSELL, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Armed Services was authorized to meet

this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT OF ADDRESS BY GEN. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER TO THE MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to inform the Senate that Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower will address an informal meeting of the two branches of Congress in the Congressional Library next Thursday at the hour of 10:30 a. m. The meeting will be held in the Coolidge Auditorium. No tickets will be issued to Members of either House. Members will be admitted upon recognition.

We have been informed that because of the limited seating capacity Members will not be permitted to bring guests. There are about 500 seats in the auditorium. I know that every Member of the Senate is anxious to obtain the benefit of General Eisenhower's views upon the situation which he found during his recent trip to Europe. It is for that reason that I am making this announcement at this time.

It is the general's desire to meet in executive session on Thursday with members of the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee. I make that announcement so that committee members may know of it, and so that the chairmen of the two committees may make arrangements for the meeting.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Green	Malone
Bennett	Hayden	Martin
Brewster	Hendrickson	Morse
Bricker	Hennings	Mundt
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Neely
Butler, Md.	Hill	O'Connor
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Holland	Pastore
Carlson	Hunt	Robertson
Case	Ives	Russell
Chapman	Jenner	Saltonstall
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kilgore	Smith, N. C.
Douglas	Knowland	Sparkman
Duff	Langer	Stennis
Dworshak	Lehman	Taft
Eastland	Lodge	Thye
Ecton	Long	Tobey
Ellender	McCarran	Watkins
Ferguson	McCarthy	Welker
Flanders	McClellan	Wherry
Frear	McFarland	Wiley
Fulbright	McKellar	Williams
George	McMahon	Young
Gillette	Magnuson	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senators from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR and Mr. MONROE], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT AS TO CALLING THE CALENDAR

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to announce that it is our intention to call the calendar from time to time, as often as possible, in order to keep it clear. While there is not much on the calendar at present, we expect to have a call of the calendar on Monday next.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Will there be an adjournment, and a call of the calendar under rule VIII?

Mr. McFARLAND. I see no objection to that being done.

Mr. WHERRY. In other words, the Senator does not intend to ask unanimous consent for the call of the calendar?

Mr. McFARLAND. No.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McFARLAND subsequently said: In further answer to the question of the distinguished minority leader, I ask unanimous consent that on next Monday, following the transaction of routine business, there be a call of the calendar for the consideration of unobjected-to bills.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be allowed to submit reports from committees, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and make insertions in the Record, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

#### REPORT ON SURVEY OF MINERAL AND NATIONAL MONUMENT VALUES, JOSHUA TREE NATIONAL MONUMENT, CALIF.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a survey of the area within the revised boundaries of the Joshua Tree National Monument with a view to determining to what extent the said area is more valuable for minerals than for the national monument purposes for which it was created (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### REPORT ON LEASES OF PROPERTY BY DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on



leases of real or personal property by the Department of the Army, as of December 1, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS— WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Acting Attorney General of the United States, withdrawing the name of Wacław Zaremba from a report relating to aliens whose deportation he suspended more than 6 months ago, transmitted to the Senate on September 1, 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Acting Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, granting the applications for permanent residence to certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in each case and the reasons for granting the applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Acting Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each case, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### REPORT ON DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN RECORDS

A letter from the Administrator of General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Archivist of the United States on the disposal of certain records for the calendar year 1950 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

#### AMENDMENT OF RUBBER ACT OF 1948

A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal the first two sentences of section 9 (a) of the Rubber Act of 1948, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIAL

Petitions, and so forth, were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

"Senate Joint Memorial 2

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the creation of a Department of Natural Resources, the establishment of regional or branch offices of that and other Federal departments and agencies, and for the location of a United States Military Academy of the Air in Colorado

"Whereas the Honorable Herbert Hoover, Chairman of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, has recommended the reorganization of the Department of the Interior and the incorporation of its functions and related functions concerned with the conservation and development of natural resources into a new Department of Natural Resources; and

"Whereas it would be highly desirable that regional offices of that and other Federal departments and agencies be established in order to bring the Federal Government and its activities closer to the people; and

"Whereas consideration is being given to the establishment of a United States Military Academy of the Air: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the senate of the thirty-eighth general assembly of the State of Colorado (the house of representatives concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to approve legislation for—*

*"(1) The creation of a new Department of Natural Resources;*

*"(2) The location of a regional office of that Department and of other important Federal departments and agencies in Colorado; and*

*"(3) The location of the United States Military Academy of the Air likewise in Colorado; be it further*

*"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Colorado of the United States.*

"GORDON ALLOTT,

*"President of the senate,*

"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,

*"Secretary of the senate,*

"DAVID A. HAMIL,

*"Speaker of the house  
of representatives.*

"VINCENT CRAWSHAW,

*"Chief Clerk of the house  
of representatives."*

A joint resolution of the senate of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution relating to the central Arizona project

"Whereas there is pending before the Congress of the United States a bill which would authorize construction of the central Arizona reclamation project; and

"Whereas no provision is made for payment by the project of any part of the interest on the national debt, which would be incurred to construct the project; and

"Whereas the Secretary of the Interior has reported that he estimates the cost of the project at \$708,000,000 and the time for the recovery of the principal at 75 years, and, therefore, that the project would cost the taxpayers of the United States for interest alone, at 2½ percent per annum, in excess of \$2,000,000,000; and

"Whereas the taxpayers of California would be required to pay in excess of \$172,000,000 of such interest; and

"Whereas the central Arizona project is designed to provide irrigation at exorbitant cost to grow common field crops, with the result that additional taxes would be required to pay Government subsidies on such crops and such project would not, therefore, enhance the national welfare; and

"Whereas the central Arizona project would require the use of 1,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power annually (the equivalent to the use of 2,500,000 barrels of fuel oil) to pump irrigation water to a height of 1,000 feet, and such use would be an economic waste of an urgently needed public resource; and

"Whereas the construction cost of the irrigation features of the project alone would be many times the value of the land, when irrigated and the irrigators would not repay any part of such construction cost; and

"Whereas such central Arizona project is, therefore, economically unsound; and

"Whereas sufficient water for such central Arizona project could be secured only by diverting to that project water now needed to serve authorized and existing projects in the lower basin of the Colorado River; and

"Whereas the diversion of water from such existing projects would jeopardize the water supply of over 4,000,000 residents of California, who, in reliance on their contracts for

water executed by the United States Government, have invested more than \$500,000,000 to provide facilities to enable them to use their share of water and power from the Colorado River; and

"Whereas the rights of California to the use of Colorado River water have been established by prior appropriations and by contracts with the Secretary of the Interior under the Boulder Canyon Project Act, and the Secretary of the Interior has declared that 'If the contentions of California are correct, there will be no dependable water supply available from the Colorado River for this diversion: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to refuse passage of any bill authorizing the central Arizona project as proposed; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to adopt legislation consenting to the joinder of the United States in an interstate suit in the Supreme Court for the determination of the water rights of the States of the lower basin of the Colorado River; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That the Colorado River Board of California and all other agencies and officers of the State of California are directed to use all means within their power to carry out the objectives of this resolution; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the chairmen of appropriate congressional committees, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."*

A paper in the nature of a memorial from the board of directors of the Lions Club, San Juan, Tex., relating to the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States to give title to the Federal Government of the tidelands off the shore of Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### DEFEND AMERICA AT HOME — DON'T WASTE AMERICAN LIVES ON FOREIGN SOIL—PETITION

Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a petition signed by about 3,000 citizens of the State of Iowa, entitled "Defend America at Home—Don't Waste American Lives on Foreign Soil."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petition presented by the Senator from Iowa will be received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### SCHICK HOSPITAL AT CLINTON, IOWA— RESOLUTION OF IOWA LEGISLATURE

Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a certified copy of a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Iowa, requesting Congress to take immediate action to cause the Veterans' Administration to increase the use of Schick Hospital at Clinton, Iowa.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### Senate Concurrent Resolution 4

Whereas the former Schick General Hospital, Clinton, Iowa, now being used exclusively for domiciliary purposes by the Veterans' Administration; and

Whereas the said veterans' domiciliary at Clinton, Iowa, is now being operated at less than one-fourth the capacity of the institution, resulting in inefficient, costly, and wasteful administration; and

Whereas thousands of veterans in the central United States are now urgently in need of hospitalization, convalescence, and rehabilitation; and

Whereas many more thousands of disabled and sick veterans will soon be added, as a result of the fighting in Korea; and

Whereas the Schick Hospital should be opened to full capacity to provide care for the many thousand veterans and veterans-to-be, who are now in need of hospitalization, convalescence, and rehabilitation; and

Whereas the Iowa Senate and House of the Fifty-second General Assembly by Senate Concurrent Resolution 10, passed a resolution of February 3, 1947, requesting the Veterans' Administration to utilize Schick Hospital at Clinton, Iowa, with its suitable facilities and very desirable location for the permanent care of veterans; and

Whereas in the interests of economy and in the interest of the veterans of the central United States, we deem it advisable and necessary that the veterans' domiciliary at Clinton, Iowa, be used to full capacity; and

Whereas the Veterans' Administration has been deaf to the plea of veterans that the Schick Hospital at Clinton, Iowa, be opened to full bed capacity, thereby utilizing present existing facilities; Therefore be it

*Resolved by the senate (the house concurring),* That the Congress of the United States take immediate action to cause the Veterans' Administration to increase the use of Schick Hospital at Clinton, Iowa, from the present limited 500 domiciliary beds to also include an additional minimum of 1,000 beds for hospitalization, convalescence, and rehabilitation; and be it further

*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be prepared and forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Iowa Members of the United States Senate and the Iowa Members of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and Gen. Carl R. Gray, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

O. H. HENNINGSEN.

We, W. H. Nicholas, Lieutenant Governor of Iowa and Carroll A. Lane, secretary of the senate, hereby certify that the above and foregoing resolution was adopted by the senate and house of the Fifty-fourth General Assembly of Iowa.

W. H. NICHOLAS,  
Lieutenant Governor of Iowa.  
CARROLL A. LANE,  
Secretary of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

#### REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. McFARLAND, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 658. A bill to further amend the Communications Act of 1934; without amendment (Rept. No. 44).

#### RESOLUTIONS REPORTED BY COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration of sundry resolutions ordered reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration. First, from the

Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably Senate Resolution No. 40 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 40), as follows:

*Resolved,* That there be printed 30,000 additional copies of the pamphlet entitled "Selling to Your Government," such additional copies to be for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Arizona a question as to the resolutions. How many has the Senator to report?

Mr. HAYDEN. About eight of them. Mr. ELLENDER. How many of them would create new subcommittees?

Mr. HAYDEN. One. Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator kindly tell us what that is?

Mr. HAYDEN. The resolution would not create a new subcommittee. The subcommittee was created only about a month ago. The purpose is to increase the limit of expenses under Senate Resolution 366, Eighty-first Congress, relating to investigation of internal security of the United States by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ELLENDER. Who will appoint the subcommittee?

Mr. HAYDEN. The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much money is requested by the resolution?

Mr. HAYDEN. The request was for \$150,000 for a 2-year term of the committee. Half of that is requested until next January.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, the appropriation which is sought is to be cut in half?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. The proposed appropriation is to be for 1 year, instead of allowing \$150,000 for 1 year?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; the request was for \$150,000 for 2 years. We limited the time to January 31 on all these resolutions, because they will come back to the committee, and the Senate can consider them again next January.

Mr. ELLENDER. Do the resolutions give authority to the committee to select experts and a clerical force in addition to the experts and clerical forces now authorized by the Reorganization Act?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, reserving the right further to object, I am in hopes the matter will be delayed for a week or 10 days. As chairman of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee dealing with the legislative branch, I asked Mr. Oco Thompson, the Financial Clerk of the Senate, to prepare for me some data showing the extent to which the Senate has been spending money for special investigations. The work has not yet been completed, but I have today a partial report and offer it to the Senate for its perusal. The summary was made by Mr. Thomp-

son, as I have just indicated, for the 10-year period from the year 1940 to the year 1950, with an estimate for 1951.

There is a great hue and cry about cutting expenses here and cutting expenses there in an effort to try to reduce Government spending. I think we in the Senate should set the example.

For the fiscal year 1940 the total amount of money spent by the Senate from the contingent fund for special investigations amounted to \$170,268.04. For 1941 it was approximately the same amount. For 1942 it was \$210,000 plus. For 1943 it was \$381,000 plus. For 1944 it was \$385,000 plus. For 1945 it was \$427,000 plus. For 1946 it was \$588,000 plus. For 1947 it was \$692,000 plus. For 1948 it was \$1,269,603. For 1949 it was \$1,068,461. For last year, 1950, it was \$1,277,000 plus. The estimate for 1951 is \$1,732,000.

Mr. President and Members of the Senate, as I tried to point out a moment ago, these sums are in addition to the amount which is now being spent by all the regular committees of this body. These sums do not include the tremendous cost of printing the many reports made by these special committees. As all Senators know, under the Reorganization Act each committee is empowered to employ a force of six on its clerical staff, and a force of four experts. I would urge no objection to the creation of necessary special committees created by the standing committees of the Senate provided that the expert and clerical assistance used would be that provided for under the Reorganization Act. I realize that in some cases it may be necessary to provide additional help, and if a good case can be made, then the Senate should act accordingly.

A certain practice has arisen here. I do not want to accuse any Senator. But we have in the Capitol quite a few experts who seem to be very good at selling themselves to Senate groups, organizing special committees to investigate all sorts of problems, and they succeed in spending quite a bit of money in so doing.

I wish to ask the Senator from Arizona to postpone consideration of the resolutions for 10 days so that we can look further into the matter and allow me to bring before the Senate the whole picture, including in detail the amount of money we are now spending for such purposes, and the possibilities of having all investigations made within the committees themselves with the force that each committee is empowered to employ to conduct its business. I believe that I can present what I consider as astounding figures, the excessive printing bills incident to this special work.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Committee on Rules and Administration adopted the practice that no resolution providing for an investigation shall extend it any further than January 31 of this year. All the committees that were created in the last Congress were to expire on the 31st of January. So it would seem proper—

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.



Mr. ELLENDER. May I suggest, if the Senator insists on action being taken now, that we extend the life of the existing subcommittees to June 30, the end of the present fiscal year? That would include existing subcommittees that have been heretofore at work and not those that have not been organized and without clerical and expert assistance. That will give us a chance to look into the matter. It will give Congress a better opportunity of taking up the question during this year when we provide for funds to operate the legislative branch of our Government for the next fiscal year. If the Senator will consent to follow my suggestion I shall not object. I should like opportunity further to study this matter with a view of trying to save a few dollars, if I can. It strikes me that if we are to save money for the taxpayers during this emergency we in the Senate should set the example, as I indicated a while ago.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have been greatly delighted to hear what the Senator from Louisiana has said. I think the Senate ought to take the lead in cutting down expenditures, and in many cases cutting out expenditures. I hope the Senator will not ask that the subcommittee be empowered to continue until next June. I believe, if the Senator will examine the situation, he will find that the money can be cut out at the present time, that it will not be necessary to provide money to carry on the work until June. When matters of this kind are postponed from time to time, as the Senator knows, it is very difficult to prevent adoption of resolutions relating to them when a Senator asks for their adoption. I hope the Senator will act at once. The Senator is a very able member of the Appropriations Committee and has done wonderful work on that committee, and I hope he will undertake to have action taken to end the work now.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, let me reply to the Senator from Tennessee. In the first place the fiscal year has nothing to do with the session of Congress. The fiscal year operates with respect to the executive branch of the Government. Congress meets in January and adjourns some time in the summer when it gets around to it. So the appropriations have to start in January. The 30th of June is a date of no significance so far as Congress is concerned.

Second, let me point out—

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Senator well knows that once special committees are established, it is rather hard to root them out. From time to time they seem to be able to obtain funds with which to continue and with which to build up large clerical and expert forces.

This is my fifteenth year of service as a Member of the Senate, and from session to session I have seen here a good many of the same persons, who work from one special subcommittee to another. They seem to have a knack at being able to "sell a bill of goods" to some of my distinguished colleagues. A special subcommittee employing a large

staff is created, and it goes on from year to year.

I do not think I am being unreasonable about this matter and I again renew my suggestion.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator should be fair about it. There are men who are expert investigators.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to say that my comments may not be applicable to all such subcommittees, but I know of quite a number which I would brand in that way.

Mr. HAYDEN. If such persons are efficient and if they do the work required to be done, why not employ them?

Mr. ELLENDER. As I have just pointed out to the distinguished Senator, in the past 10 years the amounts spent for these purposes have increased enormously. Today we are spending 10 times more for these purposes than we spent 10 years ago. It strikes me that we should draw the line somewhere. All I am requesting is a little more time to study the resolution. The distinguished Senator has reported these resolutions to the Senate today, and I should like to have a little time in which to consider them.

As chairman of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, dealing with legislative expenditures, I am responsible to some extent for recommending appropriations of these funds, and I should like to have an opportunity to look into the matter, with a view to ascertaining how much more money it will cost.

The Senator from Arizona has eight more resolutions ready. I do not know what the total amount will be; but I have before me a brief statement, prepared by Mr. Oco Thompson, financial clerk of the Senate, which indicates that for the last 5 months of 1950 special committees have spent \$866,029.19. That is five times more than was spent in the entire fiscal year of 1940.

I believe that we should draw the line somewhere and should show an inclination to economize in our own operations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in full in the RECORD, following my remarks, the figures to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the tabulations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Expenditures paid by the Senate during the fiscal years shown for investigations by the standing committees (including subcommittees), special committees, and joint committees*

Fiscal year:	
1940.....	\$170,268.04
1941.....	170,619.16
1942.....	210,574.02
1943.....	381,381.89
1944.....	385,983.52
1945.....	427,574.15
1946.....	588,507.15
1947.....	692,603.65
1948.....	1,269,603.02
1949.....	1,277,094.39
1950.....	1,732,000.00
1951 (estimated).....	1,068,461.45

**SUMMARY OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE FOR THE LAST 6 MONTHS OF 1950, SHOWING AMOUNTS SPENT, UNEXPENDED BALANCES, AND NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES**

Biographical Congressional Directory: No limitation, Unexpended balance, December

1, 1950, \$2,726.79; number of employees, November 1950, 3.

Joint Committee on Atomic Energy: Limitation, fiscal year 1951. Appropriation, \$160,135; number of employees, November 1950, 18.

Joint Committee on the Economic Report: Limitation, fiscal year 1951. Appropriation, \$125,585; number of employees, November 1951, 14.

Joint Committee on Federal Expenditures: No limitation. Appropriation (September 6, 1950), \$20,000; number of employees, November 1950, 3.

Joint Committee on Printing: Limitation, fiscal year 1951. Appropriation, \$28,180; number of employees, November 1950, 3.

Senate policy committees: Limitation, fiscal year 1951. Appropriation, majority, \$45,715; minority, \$45,715; total, \$91,430; number of employees, November 1950, majority, 10; minority, 6.

Senate conference committees: Limitation, fiscal year 1951. Appropriation, majority, \$30,280; minority, \$30,280; total, \$60,560; number of employees, November 1950, majority, 10; minority, 7.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry (subcommittee investigating ways and means of stimulating the exports of surplus agricultural commodities), under authority of Senate Resolution 173, agreed to October 13, 1949: Limitation, Eighty-first Congress. Amount authorized, \$25,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, \$8,859.06; balance December 1, 1950, \$16,140.94; number of employees, November 1950, 1.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry (subcommittee making a study and investigation of current infestations by the European corn borer), under authority of Senate Resolution 158, agreed to October 13, 1949: Limitation, Eighty-first Congress. Amount authorized, \$10,000; no expenditures.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry (subcommittee making a study of the foot and mouth disease), under authority of Senate Resolution 223, agreed to June 12, 1948, and Senate Resolution 72, agreed to February 25, 1949: Limitation, Eightieth Congress (S. Res. 223): Eighty-first Congress (S. Res. 72): Amount authorized by Senate Resolution 223, \$6,000; by Senate Resolution 72, \$2,000; total, \$8,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, \$2,332.72; balance December 1, 1950, \$5,667.28; no employees during November 1950.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry (subcommittee investigating the production of all types of agricultural crops), under authority of Senate Resolution 36, agreed to April 11, 1949 and Senate Resolution 198, agreed to February 1, 1950: Limitation, Eighty-first Congress. Amount authorized by Senate Resolution 36, \$12,000; by Senate Resolution 198, \$38,000; total \$50,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, \$26,805.76; balance December 1, 1950, \$23,194.24; number of employees, November 1950, 4.

Committee on Appropriations (Foreign Economic Cooperation Subcommittee), under authority of Senate Resolution 193, agreed to October 14, 1943, and the General Appropriations Act for 1951: Limitation, fiscal year 1951. Amount appropriated, \$50,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, \$21,338.73; balance December 1, 1950, \$28,661.27; number of employees, November 1950, 11.

Committee on Appropriations (subcommittee investigating any matter within the jurisdiction of the committee), under authority of Senate Resolution 129, agreed to June 26, 1947: No limitation. Amount authorized, \$50,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, \$25,848.51; balance December 1, 1950, \$24,151.49; no employees during November 1950.

Committee on Armed Services (subcommittee investigating any matter within the jurisdiction of the committee), under authority of Senate Resolution 93, agreed to

June 22, 1949: Limitation, December 31, 1950. Amount authorized, \$25,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, \$12,880.98; balance December 1, 1950, \$12,119.02; number of employees, November 1950, 8.

Committee on Banking and Currency (Subcommittee on Banking and Credit Legislation), under authority of Senate Resolution 101, agreed to May 6, 1949, and Senate Resolution 218, agreed to February 9, 1950: Limitation, February 15, 1950 (S. Res. 101), February 15, 1951 (S. Res. 218). Amount authorized, \$60,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, \$52,081.81; balance, December 1, 1950, \$7,918.19; number of employees, November 1950, 5.

Committee on Banking and Currency (subcommittee studying the operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation), under authority of Senate Resolution 219, agreed to February 8, 1950; Senate Resolution 279, agreed to May 19, 1950; and Senate Resolution 307, agreed to July 13, 1950: Limitation, June 1, 1950 (S. Res. 219), July 15, 1950 (S. Res. 279), January 31, 1951 (S. Res. 307). Amount authorized by Senate Resolution 219, \$50,000; by Senate Resolution 307, \$35,000; total, \$85,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, \$62,830.69; balance, December 1, 1950, \$22,169.31; number of employees, November 1950, 6.

Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments (Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations With States and Municipalities), under authority of Senate Resolution 205, agreed to February 1, 1950: Limitation, February 15, 1951. Amount authorized, \$15,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, \$10,725.60; balance, December 1, 1950, \$4,274.40; number of employees, November 1950, 2.

Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments (subcommittee studying relations with international organizations), under authority of Senate Resolution 205, agreed to February 1, 1950: Limitation, February 15, 1951. Amount authorized, \$18,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, \$10,626.88; balance, December 1, 1950, \$7,373.12; number of employees, November 1950, 2.

Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments (Investigations Subcommittee), under authority of Senate Resolution 206, agreed to February 1, 1950: Limitation, January 31, 1951. Balance from prior authority (S. Res. 52, agreed to February 9, 1949), \$6,641.27; amount authorized by Senate Resolution 206, \$100,000; total authorization, \$106,641.27; expenditures to November 30, 1950, \$68,643.64; balance, December 1, 1950, \$37,997.63; number of employees, November 1950, 12.

Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments (Investigations Subcommittee), under authority of Senate Resolution 280, agreed to June 7, 1950: Limitation, January 31, 1951. Amount authorized, \$10,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, \$6,875.86; balance December 1, 1950, \$3,124.14; no employees during November 1950.

Committee on Finance (Subcommittee on Social Security Programs), under authority of Senate Resolution 300, agreed to June 20, 1950: Limitation, none. Amount authorized, \$25,000; no expenditures.

Committee on Foreign Relations (Subcommittee on Disloyalty of State Department Employees), under authority of Senate Resolution 231, agreed to February 22, 1950; Senate Resolution 237, agreed to March 15, 1950; and Senate Resolution 303, agreed to June 29, 1950: Limitation, Eighty-first Congress. Amount authorized by Senate Resolution 237, \$25,000; by Senate Resolution 303, \$10,000; total, \$35,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, \$27,407.11; balance December 1, 1950, \$7,592.89; no employees during November 1950.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs (Subcommittee on the Fuel Reserves of the United States), under authority of Senate

Resolution 239, agreed to August 15, 1950: Limitation, January 3, 1951. Amount authorized, \$20,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, \$327.80; balance December 1, 1950, \$19,672.20; number of employees, November 1950, 1.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs (Subcommittee Investigating Any Matter Referred to the Committee), under authority of Senate Resolution 32, agreed to March 18, 1949: Limitation, Eighty-first Congress. Amount authorized, \$25,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, \$3,355.14; balance December 1, 1950, \$21,644.86; number of employees, November 1950, none.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs (subcommittee on relations of the United States with the Indians and the Indian tribes), under authority of Senate Resolution 292, agreed to July 13, 1950: Limitation, January 31, 1951. Amount authorized, \$25,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, \$1,829.45; balance December 1, 1950, \$23,170.55; number of employees, November 1950, 2.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce (subcommittee investigating the airline industry, merchant marine, transportation, communications, etc.), under authority of Senate Resolution 50, agreed to April 11, 1949, and Senate Resolution 308, agreed to July 27, 1950: Limitation, Eighty-first Congress (S. Res. 50), February 28, 1951 (S. Res. 308). Amount authorized by Senate Resolution 50, \$165,000; by Senate Resolution 308, \$69,000; total, \$234,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, \$180,192.72; balance, December 1, 1950, \$53,807.28; number of employees, November 1950, 11.

Committee on the Judiciary (Immigration subcommittee), under authority of Senate Resolution 228, agreed to February 27, 1950: Limitation, January 31, 1951. Amount authorized, \$80,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, \$63,840.88; balance December 1, 1950, \$16,159.12; number of employees, November 1950, 16.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (subcommittee on health), under authority of Senate Resolution 273, agreed to May 26, 1950: Limitation, Eighty-first Congress. Amount authorized, \$37,800; expenditures to November 30, 1950, \$15,680.36; balance December 1, 1950, \$22,119.64; number of employees, November 1950, 7.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations), under authority of Senate Resolution 140, agreed to August 15, 1949, and Senate Resolution 217, agreed to February 1, 1950: Limitation, December 31, 1950. Amount authorized by Senate Resolution 140, \$25,000; by Senate Resolution 217, \$108,000; total, \$133,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, \$109,886.34; balance, December 1, 1950, \$23,113.66; number of employees, November 1950, 17.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service (Investigations Subcommittee), under authority of Senate Resolution 78, agreed to April 11, 1949; Senate Resolution 179, agreed to October 13, 1949; and Senate Resolution 275, agreed to May 24, 1950: Limitation, December 31, 1949 (S. Res. 78), Eighty-first Congress (S. Res. 179). Amount authorized by Senate Resolution 78, \$5,000; by Senate Resolution 179, \$3,000; by Senate Resolution 275, \$3,000; total, \$11,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, \$9,554.07; balance, December 1, 1950, \$1,445.93; number of employees, November 1950, 1.

Committee on Public Works (Investigations Subcommittee), under authority of Senate Resolution 123, agreed to August 11, 1949: Limitation, Eighty-first Congress. Amount authorized, \$50,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, \$7,719.33; balance, December 1, 1950, \$42,280.67; no employees during November 1950.

Committee on Rules and Administration (Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections), under authority of Senate Resolution 250,

agreed to April 13, 1950, and Senate Resolution 311, agreed to July 27, 1950: No limitation. Amount authorized by Senate Resolution 250, \$50,000; by Senate Resolution 311, \$25,000; total, \$75,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, \$23,535.21; balance, December 1, 1950, \$51,464.79; number of employees, November 1950, 9.

Joint Committee on Defense Production, under authority of Public Law 774, Eighty-first Congress, approved September 8, 1950 (Defense Production Act of 1950): Limitation, fiscal year 1951. Amount authorized (from September 8, 1950, to June 30, 1951), \$40,694.43; to be disbursed by the House of Representatives.

Select Committee on Small Business (subcommittee investigating the fuel supplies in New England), under authority of Senate Resolution 344, agreed to September 15, 1950, and Senate Resolution 354, agreed to September 19, 1950: Limitation, December 15, 1950 (S. Res. 344). Amount authorized (S. Res. 354), \$5,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, \$3,784.58; balance December 1, 1950, \$1,215.42; Number of employees, November 1950, 10.

Special Committee Investigating Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, under authority of Senate Resolution 202, agreed to May 3, 1950 and Senate Resolution 334, agreed to August 30, 1950: Limitation, March 31, 1950. Amount authorized by Senate Resolution 202, \$150,000; by Senate Resolution 334, \$50,000; total, \$200,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, \$95,271.84; balance December 1, 1950, \$104,728.16; number of employees, November 1950, 30.

Total number of employees listed above, 229.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, does the Senator from Louisiana object to the present consideration of these resolutions?

Mr. ELLENDER. Unless I can get time to look into 'hem further, I do.

As I said, I would not object to the immediate consideration of resolutions that would expire on June 30, 1951, in all cases where the special committees have been created and actually at work.

Mr. HAYDEN. I can report them and have them placed on the calendar, and then the Senator can take his own time, if he so desires.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to have some additional time. At this time, Mr. President, I object to the request for the immediate consideration of the resolutions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard, and the resolutions will be received and placed on the calendar, for consideration later.

The resolutions reported by Mr. HAYDEN from the Committee on Rules and Administration were ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

S. Res. 40. Resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the pamphlet entitled "Selling To Your Government"; without amendment (Rept. No. 35);

S. Res. 19. Resolution authorizing the temporary employment of additional personnel by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; without amendment (Rept. No. 36);

S. Res. 33. Resolution extending the authority for the investigation of the fuel reserves and to formulate a fuel policy for the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 37);

S. Res. 32. Resolution extending the authority for an investigation of the relationship of the United States with the Indians; without amendment (Rept. No. 38);

S. Res. 51. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive



Departments to employ temporary additional personnel and increasing the limit of expenditures; with an amendment (Rept. No. 39);

S. Res. 18. Resolution to increase the limit of expenditures for hearings and investigations by the Committee on Armed Services; with additional amendments (Rept. No. 40);

S. Res. 17. Resolution continuing the authority for a study of the operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries; with an amendment (Rept. No. 41);

S. Res. 6. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to employ additional personnel from February 1, 1951, to January 31, 1952, and increasing the limit of expenditures; without amendment (Rept. No. 42); and

S. Res. 7. Resolution to increase the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 366, Eighty-first Congress, relating to the internal security of the United States; with additional amendments (Rept. No. 43).

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 659. A bill for the relief of Ritsuko Chojin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. LODGE also introduced Senate bill 660, to waive certain requirements of the naturalization laws in the case of persons whose sons or daughters were killed while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. IVES introduced Senate bill 661, to provide for the appointment of male citizens as nurses in the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. IVES also introduced Senate bill 662, to amend section 406 of the Nationality Act of 1940, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. IVES also introduced Senate bill 663, to provide for the admission to the United States of an additional number of aliens of Italian nationality, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

S. 664. A bill to amend section 4 of the act of May 5, 1870, as amended and codified, entitled "An act to provide for the creation of corporations in the District of Columbia by general law," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 665. A bill for the relief of D. Lane Powers and Elaine Powers Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 666. A bill for the relief of George Pantelas; and

S. 667. A bill for the relief of Pieter Mathias Pennings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 668. A bill for the relief of Francis A. Gunn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 669. A bill for the relief of Louis Bernard Lapides; and

S. 670. A bill for the relief of Alfredo Giuseppis Gallo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. SMATHERS):

S. 671. A bill for the relief of the Fort Pierce Port District; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 672. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the employment of minors within the District of Columbia," approved May 29, 1928; and

S. 673. A bill to permit the exchange of land belonging to the District of Columbia for land belonging to the abutting property owner or owners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 674. A bill for the relief of Arthur Koestler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 675. A bill for the relief of Bedrich Donath, Vera Donath, and Brigitta Graetzer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 676. A bill to provide for research in child life; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. CASE, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. ECTON, Mr. NEELY, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. DUFF, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina, Mr. IVES, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. NIXON, Mr. THYE, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. WILEY, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. MAGNUSON) also introduced Senate bill 677, to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. DOUGLAS also introduced Senate bill 678, to prevent undue increases in the number of permanent personnel, and to facilitate the transfer of employees from nondefense to defense agencies, in the Federal Government, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 679. A bill for the relief of John Quincy Adams, formerly a captain, Medical Corps, United States Navy; and

S. 680. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to provide leave credit for National Guard personnel undergoing training under provisions 94, 97, and 99 of the National Defense Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 681. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to increase the amount of wages which disabled annuitants and survivors of insured employees may earn without impairing the benefits accorded to them under such act; and

S. 682. A bill to exempt the appointed members of the national advisory councils for the National Institutes of Health from certain provisions of the criminal laws; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 683 (by request). A bill authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes during 1951; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 684. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act so as to provide a more effective distribution of mortgage loans insured under title I, to give holders of such mortgage loans preference in the refinancing of loans on a noninsured basis, to adjust the loan limitations governing title II loans so as to provide more effective assistance to production and subsistence loan borrowers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 685. A bill to subordinate claims of the United States to certain wage claims; and

S. 686. A bill for the relief of Dora Jenny Wagner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 687. A bill for the relief of Valeria Kempinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 688. A bill for the relief of Eugenio Belini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 689. A bill to authorize the sale of land allotted to Annie Shot To Pieces;

S. 690. A bill to permit certain lands heretofore conveyed to the city of Canton, S. Dak., for park, recreation, airport, or other public purposes, to be leased by it so long as the income therefrom is used for such purposes;

S. 691. A bill to authorize the sale of land allotted to William Burning Breast on the Rosebud Reservation, S. Dak.;

S. 692. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Len Bliss a patent in fee to certain land;

S. 693. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Winfred DeCoteau a patent in fee to certain land; and

S. 694. A bill to authorize the sale of inherited interests in certain allotted land under the jurisdiction of the Sisseton Indian Agency, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 695. A bill for the relief of William Greville Birkett; and

S. 696. A bill for the relief of Pericles G. Callimanopoulos and his family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 697. A bill for the relief of Teh-Jen Lee;

S. 698. A bill for the relief of William E. Koerting; and

S. 699. A bill for the relief of James Shellenberger, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. J. Res. 25. Joint resolution for the relief of certain creditors of the Norwood Pulp & Machinery Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. NIXON, and Mr. MALONE):

S. J. Res. 26. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suits in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system available for use in the lower Colorado River Basin; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### GRANTING OF CITIZENSHIP TO CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide that alien mothers and fathers whose sons lost their lives in the Armed Forces of the United States in time of war may be granted United States citizenship notwithstanding their inability to speak, read, or write the English language or to sign their names. This proposed legislation is suggested to me by the action of State Senator Michael LoPresti, of Boston, who has just introduced in the Massachusetts Legislature a resolution memorializing Congress in favor of such legislation. I understand that the parents of children who have died in the service of their country must still register as aliens because of their inability to read and write English. These men and women have given their flesh and blood to the country of their

choice. No citizen can do more. They richly deserve citizenship, and have unquestionably proven their right to have it.

The bill (S. 660) to waive certain requirements of the naturalization laws in the case of persons whose sons or daughters were killed while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States, introduced by Mr. LODGE, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### APPOINTMENT OF MALE NURSES IN ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the appointment of male citizens as nurses in the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared explaining its purpose be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 661) to provide for the appointment of male citizens as nurses in the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. IVES, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The statement presented by Mr. IVES is as follows:

##### STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES

This bill would provide for equal status for male nurses in the Army and Navy Nurse Corps. In World War II, and in the years ensuing, men, performing the same duties as women nurses, received no officer status and were subordinate to women officers. I raise no objection to the fact that women served in superior command posts, but I strongly feel that men should be given an opportunity to have equal rank for equal duties.

Therefore, I am introducing this bill in collaboration with Congresswoman BOLTON in the House. In the past objection to this proposal has been raised by the Department of Defense on the grounds that such a realignment would necessitate great administrative and legislative difficulty within the Department. I do not feel this to be an adequate ground for rejection of the proposal, inasmuch as male officers in the Nurse Corps could be housed with Regular officers—or in the same quarters as male doctors who also have officer status. I can see no administrative difficulty that would be serious enough to deprive qualified men from attaining appropriate rank as members of the Nurse Corps.

##### AMENDMENT OF SECTION 406 OF NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 406 of the Nationality Act of 1940, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared, explaining the purpose of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 662) to amend section 406 of the Nationality Act of 1940, introduced by Mr. IVES, was read twice by

its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. IVES is as follows:

##### STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES

The Nationality Act of 1940 provides that a naturalized citizen of the United States is subject to loss of citizenship should he reside outside the United States for five continuous years after having been naturalized. The act also exempts veterans of the Spanish-American War and World War I from this provision of the law. I believe that veterans of World War II should be given the same privilege as is afforded to the previous veterans.

Great injustices are being wrought because the act has not been thus amended. Men who have served their adopted country with valor and heroism are being denied the same opportunities enjoyed by their counterparts of our previous wars. This to me is unjust and therefore I am introducing this amendment with the hope that the veterans of World War II will be treated with the deference they deserve as far as the Nationality Act is concerned.

##### ADMISSION INTO UNITED STATES OF ADDITIONAL ITALIAN ALIENS

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the admission to the United States of an additional number of aliens of Italian nationality, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared explaining the purpose of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 663) to provide for the admission to the United States of an additional number of aliens of Italian nationality, introduced by Mr. IVES, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. IVES is as follows:

##### STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES

This bill would provide for the issuance of a number of visas to Italian immigrants equal to the unused number forfeited during the last period of hostilities. During that time, 1939-46, travel between Italy and the United States was at a standstill; consequently many persons who would have had the opportunity to come to the United States were unable to do so.

In the spirit of humanity and fairness, I urge that this bill be given full consideration, for if it is enacted, we shall know that we have thus afforded to the Italian people an opportunity they deserve and we shall have corrected an inequity which exists in our present immigration procedure.

##### PERSONNEL STRENGTH OF MARINE CORPS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. ECRON], the Senator from

West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPFEL], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps at four full-strength combat divisions, four full-strength air wings, and other organic units, and to fix the personnel strength of the Marine Corps at not less than 400,000, and, in addition, to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does that mean that it is to be the permanent establishment, or is it merely to apply in time of war?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is to be a permanent establishment.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is to be a permanent establishment of 400,000 men. Is that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. What is the present strength?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it is approximately 160,000.

Mr. CONNALLY. The bill would more than double the present number, would it not?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It would.

Mr. President, I should like to add that identical bills have been introduced in the House by 60 Members, and there will probably be introduced today at least from 5 to 10 more identical bills.

The bill (S. 677) to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and other Senators), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.



# TRANSFER OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES—REPEAL OF A PORTION OF THE WHITTEN AMENDMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to repeal that portion of the so-called Whitten amendment, dealing with the transfer of Government employees, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, and a statement which I have prepared in support of the bill, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and statement by the Senator from Illinois will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 678) to prevent undue increases in the number of permanent personnel, and to facilitate the transfer of employees from nondefense to defense agencies, in the Federal Government, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That after September 1, 1950, and until the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950:

(a) In making appointments in the Government service the Civil Service Commission shall make full use of its authority to make temporary appointments in order to prevent increases in the number of permanent personnel and no employee in the Federal civil service promoted or appointed to a position of higher grade shall be eligible, in the event of separation from the service through reduction in force, to reinstatement at a grade above the grade held by such employee on September 1, 1950; and all reinstatements or promotions to positions in the Federal civil service shall be temporary and for positions subject to the Classification Act of 1949 shall be made with the condition and notice to the individual reinstated, transferred or promoted that the classification grade of the position is subject to post-audit and correction by the appropriate departmental or agency personnel office or the Civil Service Commission;

(b) The names of all persons to be terminated under reductions in force in the departments and agencies of the Government shall be certified as eligible for appointment to positions in agency programs determined by the President to be related directly to national defense, if qualified, at not to exceed the grade and salary last held in the terminating agency or department; and

(c) The Department of Defense is authorized to call on other departments or agencies for such additional personnel as it may require within the limits of its funds.

SEC. 2. Section 1302 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1951 (Public Law 843, 81st Cong.), is hereby repealed.

The statement presented by Mr. DOUGLAS is as follows:

## STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

A serious problem has developed under the so-called Whitten amendment (sec. 1302 of Public Law 843, 81st Cong.—Supplemental Appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1951). Its present operation prevents an orderly flow of Federal personnel from nondefense to defense agencies. At a time when we must severely curtail the expense of the nondefense agencies, we should facilitate the movement of personnel away from them.

This would serve the dual purpose of reducing nondefense expenditures and at the

same time, make fuller use of experienced personnel where they are needed.

The Whitten amendment provides that in making appointments in the Government service the Civil Service Commission shall make full use of its authority to make temporary appointments in order to prevent increases in the number of permanent personnel. But it also provides that all transfers to positions in the Federal civil service shall be temporary.

The provision instructing the Civil Service Commission to make full use of its authority to make temporary appointments is reasonable and just. It prevents loading down the Federal Government with a tremendous number of permanent employees many of whom might be retained long after the need for them had passed. It also simplifies the problems connected with the return of veterans to their old jobs and with the employment of future veterans.

The provision that all transfers to positions in the Federal civil service shall be temporary, however, is open to serious question. Federal employees with permanent status in an old-line agency are hesitating to transfer to a defense agency where their status would be only temporary. In some cases, not even the lure of promotions is sufficient to overcome the lack of security which is the result of the provisions of the Whitten amendment.

As a matter of fact, the Whitten amendment fails to accomplish its stated purposes for the returning veteran. Take the employee who, for patriotic reasons, transfers to a defense job, thereby assuming an indefinite status: Such employee—if later drafted or if he volunteers for military service—would lose all rights to restoration either to his old or new job.

All possible steps should be taken to facilitate the flow of present Federal employees to the new emergency agencies and units which are of necessity being established. In most instances, I believe, the old agencies will find that they can continue to operate without replacing the transferred employee. The total number of Federal employees would thus be held to a considerably lower level than would be the case if all emergency agency employees had to be recruited from the outside. Also many present employees possess certain skills or forms of expertness not elsewhere available, and are familiar with the processes commonly used in the Government, thus requiring less training.

For these reasons that portion of the Whitten amendment which operates to prevent the flow of Federal employees from the nondefense to the defense agencies should be repealed, and the bill I am now introducing would do this by repealing the Whitten amendment references to transfers. As it now operates, the Whitten amendment is hampering rather than helping our defense effort. We must take all possible steps to facilitate the prompt and efficient staffing of the defense agencies and cut down on the number of employees in the nondefense agencies.

I believe my bill will accomplish the desirable objective of the Whitten amendment, yet provide protection to the employee so that transfers from nondefense to defense agencies will be facilitated, not hampered.

In my judgment, the whole problem of personnel during a period of defense mobilization should be thoroughly studied and appropriate legislation introduced. My bill will accomplish one of the desirable ends, but it is my hope that when this bill is referred to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee they will take up the broad problem as well. I understand that the chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, Mr. JOHNSTON, has indicated that his committee will make such a study. I want to congratulate Senator JOHNSTON for making this move, which indicates his acute awareness of our personnel needs.

# AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO CLOTURE

Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. LODGE) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 52), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved*, That the second paragraph of subsection 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to cloture) is amended by striking out "by two-thirds of the Senators duly chosen and sworn" and inserting in lieu thereof "by the vote of a majority of the authorized membership of the Senate."

## ALASKA STATEHOOD—AMENDMENT

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 50) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 1. An act to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1724. An act to provide for the renegotiation of contracts, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 87. Joint resolution amending section 5012 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 1726. An act to provide for the organization of the Air Force and the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Mrs. Anna Eleanor Roosevelt, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Human Rights Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years, reappointment;

George P. Baker, of Massachusetts, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Transport and Communications Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years, reappointment;

Leroy D. Stinebower, of Michigan, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Economic, Employment, and Development Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years;

Thomas D. Cabot, of Massachusetts, to be Director for International Security Affairs;

John D. Erwin, of Tennessee, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Honduras;

Monnett B. Davis, of Colorado, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Panama, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Israel;

Stanton Griffiths, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Spain;

Horatio Mooers, of Maine, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America;

William N. Fraleigh, of New Jersey, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America;

Charles H. Whitaker, of Rhode Island, now a Foreign Service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America;

Henry F. Arnold, of New Jersey, and several other Foreign Service staff officers, to be consuls of the United States; and

Jack C. McDermott, of Texas, and several other Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States.

#### A FOREIGN POLICY: WHAT'S THE ANSWER?—RADIO DEBATE BETWEEN SENATOR DOUGLAS AND SENATOR DIRKSEN

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a transcript of the debate between Senator DOUGLAS and Senator DIRKSEN on the question "A Foreign Policy: What's the Answer?" broadcast on the American Forum of the Air on January 14, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### THE WOLF CREEK PROJECT OF THE CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN—ADDRESS BY COL. HENRY WALSH

[Mr. CHAPMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the Wolf Creek project of the Cumberland River Basin, delivered by Col. Henry Walsh, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, of Nashville, Tenn., which appears in the Appendix.]

#### SENATOR KEM FILLS A NECESSARY ROLE—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEWS-LEADER OF SPRINGFIELD, MO.

[Mr. CARLSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Senator Kem Fills a Necessary Role," published in the News-Leader, of Springfield, Mo., January 20, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### TRIBUTE TO MILLARD F. CALDWELL, JR., BY CROSBY S. NOYES

[Mr. SMATHERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article paying tribute to Millard F. Caldwell, Jr., written by Crosby S. Noyes, and published in the Washington Evening Star, January 23, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### PENSIONS FOR THE ELDERLY—ARTICLE BY WILLIAM H. McMASTERS

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article regarding pensions for the elderly, written by William H. McMasters, and published in the National Welfare Advocate, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### TAXATION OF MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANIES—ARTICLE FROM THE NORTH DAKOTA UNION FARMER.

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Mutual Insurance Companies Angered by NTEA Attack," published in the North Dakota Union Farmer January 8, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### FACTS ON FOOD PRICES—EDITORIAL BY ALFRED D. STEDMAN

[Mr. HICKENLOOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Facts on Food Prices," written by Alfred D. Stedman, and published in

the St. Paul Sunday Pioneer on January 21, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### OWEN LATTIMORE—LETTER FROM EUGENE LYONS

[Mr. MCCARTHY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Eugene Lyons, regarding the attitude of the Soviet press toward Owen Lattimore, published in the New Leader, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### THE CHANGING COMPLEXION OF MEDICAL PRACTICE—EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY DR. L. R. SANTE

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from an address on the subject The Changing Complexion of Medical Practice During the Last Half Century, delivered by Dr. L. R. Sante, at the one hundred and sixteenth annual meeting of the St. Louis Medical Society, on January 3, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### THE CHRISTIAN HOPE OF THE NEW DAY—SERMON BY DR. EARLE B. JEWELL

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a sermon delivered on January 14, 1951, by Dr. Earle B. Jewell, rector of St. Andrew Episcopal Church, Kansas City, Mo., which appears in the Appendix.]

#### NEWSPAPER POLL ON KOREAN AND RUSSIAN QUESTIONS—ARTICLE BY EDWARD W. SOWERS

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article regarding a poll by the Rolla (Mo.) Daily News regarding foreign and domestic policies, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### LABOR'S APPROACH TO THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY—ADDRESS BY GEORGE M. HARRISON

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Labor's Approach to the National Emergency, delivered by George M. Harrison, president of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, before the Economic Club of New York on January 17, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### INFLATION AND THE NATIONAL SURVIVAL—ADDRESS BY HARRY A. BULLIS

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Inflation and the National Survival, delivered by Harry A. Bullis, chairman, General Mills, Inc., before the Economic Club of New York on January 17, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### WHY NOT TALK PEACE FOR A CHANGE?—EDITORIAL FROM THE HARTFORD COURANT

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why Not Talk Peace for a Change?" published in the Hartford Courant of January 24, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### DECLARATION ON MANPOWER—LETTER FROM REV. JOHN J. CAVANAUGH

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Rev. John J. Cavanaugh, president of Notre Dame University, regarding a declaration on manpower adopted at a meeting of the Association of American Colleges at Atlantic City, N. J., on January 10, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### MILITARY POLICY IN KOREA AND EUROPE—ARTICLE FROM CHICAGO DAILY TRIBUNE

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article en-

titled "Rolla, Mo., Says Quit Korea, but Stay in Europe," published in the Chicago Daily Tribune of January 18, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### PROPOSED WITHDRAWAL FROM KOREA—ARTICLE FROM THE EVANSVILLE COURIER

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Henderson Plans 'Evacuate Korea' Meeting Tonight," published in the Evansville Courier, of Evansville, Ind., on January 18, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### COMMISSION ON INTERNAL SECURITY AND INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS—STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a press release from the White House and the Executive order establishing the President's Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights.

The President is to be congratulated upon the selection of Admiral Chester W. Nimitz as Chairman of this new Commission. I am sure he will function in his usual excellent manner.

There being no objection, the release and order were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT, JANUARY 23, 1951

I have today established a Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights. The Commission will be composed of nine members. Fleet Admiral Chester W. Nimitz will serve as Chairman.

The Commission will consider in all its aspects the question of how this Nation can best deal with the problem of protecting its internal security and at the same time maintaining the freedoms of its citizens. It will consider the harm that comes from the wrong kind of action as well as the good that comes from the right kind of action.

The Commission will make a thorough examination of the laws, practices, and procedures concerning the protection of our Nation against treason, espionage, sabotage, and other subversive activities, and of the operation of and any need for changes in such laws, practices, and procedures. The Commission will also consider the methods used by public or private groups for the purpose of protecting us against such activities. It will consider these matters from the standpoint of protecting both the internal security of our country and the rights of individuals, and will seek the wisest balance that can be struck between security and freedom. The Commission will report its conclusions and recommendations for legislative, administrative, or other action it deems appropriate.

I consider the task of this Commission to be of extraordinary importance. The world is in the midst of a struggle between freedom and tyranny. The United States is one of the leaders of the free world—not just because we are powerful in material things, but because we have preserved and expanded the freedom of our people. We have built our society in the faith and in the practice of freedom—freedom of worship, freedom of speech, freedom of association and political belief.

We in this country have always been ready to protect our freedom—to protect it against external or internal enemies and to protect it against unwarranted restrictions by Government. From time to time in our history we have faced the need to protect our freedom from these different kinds of encroachment. Each of these occasions has presented our Nation with new and often conflicting considerations. To reconcile these consid-



erations, and to find the proper national policy is always difficult, and is especially so at times like the present, when our freedom is severely threatened abroad and at home.

Today we are particularly concerned by the threat to our Government and our national life arising from the activities of the forces of Communist imperialism. In addition to the vigorous action we are taking abroad to meet this threat, we must be sure that our laws and procedures at home are adequate to protect our system of government against unconstitutional attacks and to preserve our national security against treason, espionage, sabotage, and other subversive acts designed to weaken or overthrow our Government. At the same time, we are concerned lest the measures taken to protect us from these dangers infringe the liberties guaranteed by our Constitution and stifle the atmosphere of freedom in which we have so long expressed our thoughts and carried on our daily affairs.

These are problems of momentous importance for our country and its future, and for the future of our leadership in the world. They should be approached in a serious and fair-minded way by all our citizens. We must not let our differences about how to solve these problems degenerate into partisan controversies. We must continue to protect our security within the framework of our historic liberties, without thought of partisan advantage or political gain.

To keep these great problems from falling into the arena of partisanship, I am appointing this Commission of distinguished citizens on a nonpartisan basis. I believe the people of this country will receive from them an authoritative judgment on these problems, based on the facts and formulated in the national interest, with no question of political advantage.

The Commission will undoubtedly wish to focus its primary attention on Federal laws and procedures. But I do not believe the Commission should limit itself to reviewing Government actions. Instead, I hope it will consider afresh, in all its present-day ramifications, the recurrent question of how a free people protect their society from subversive attack without at the same time destroying their own liberties.

This question is, of course, far broader than the activities of the Federal Government. It concerns State and local governments as well, private groups of all kinds, and citizens in their daily work and in their homes. I hope that the report of this Commission will provide guidelines of sufficiently wide application to be helpful in protecting both internal security and individual rights in every part of our national life.

The field of study for this Commission is very complex and far reaching. Much study will be necessary before a report can be drafted. I am giving instructions that the Commission shall have complete freedom to conduct its study as it sees fit. I am asking the Commission to make such interim reports as it may deem desirable, and I hope the Commission will find it possible to complete its work in a year.

One of the important matters for the Commission to consider is the operation of the Government employee loyalty and security programs. I wish to make it clear, however, that this Commission is not being established as an appeals tribunal for individual cases. The Commission will be expected to report on the effectiveness and fairness of the Government's loyalty and security programs. In doing this, the Commission may wish to inspect individual case files—and it will be authorized to do so to whatever extent it may determine to be necessary.

In connection with loyalty and security procedures, and also in considering the operation of such statutes as the Internal Security Act of 1950, the Commission will

necessarily be reviewing information of very high security classifications. I am directing the Commission therefore, to take appropriate measures to safeguard the security of any classified or confidential information it may wish to examine.

I intend to do everything I can to enable this Commission to make a thorough and careful study.

We, in the United States have a special responsibility for leadership in these critical times, when free men the world over are strongly resisting the challenge of the Communist drive for world domination. We must guard our freedom well—guard it from armed assault, guard it from subversive infiltration, guard it from internal suppression and the deadly imposition of conformity. For the kind of freedom we have enjoyed in this country has been the shining goal for millions in other lands—and the results of freedom in this country have been the shattering reply to the false claims of Communist imperialism.

If we are to continue growing in strength here at home—if we are to continue leading the world toward peace with freedom and justice—we must both protect the security of our Nation and safeguard the freedom of our people.

I know the Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights will undertake its work in full recognition of the immense importance and world-wide significance of its task.

#### EXECUTIVE ORDER ESTABLISHING THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON INTERNAL SECURITY AND INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS

By virtue of the authority vested in me as President of the United States, it is ordered as follows:

1. There is hereby established in the Executive Office of the President a commission to be known as the President's Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights, which shall be composed of a Chairman, a Vice Chairman, and seven other members, all of whom shall be designated by the President.

2. (a) The Commission shall make a thorough study of the problem of providing for the internal security of the United States and at the same time protecting the rights and freedoms of individuals. The Commission shall consider how this problem should be met by Government action and by private action. Among other things, the Commission shall examine the laws, practices, and procedures concerning protection against treason, sabotage, espionage, and other matters affecting the internal security of the Nation; and the Commission shall consider the operation of and any need for changes in such laws, practices, and procedures. The subjects considered by the Commission shall include the Government employee loyalty program and the Government employee security program. The Commission shall also consider the need for protecting individuals from unwarranted attacks and from unwarranted infringement of their rights and liberties in the name of security.

(b) The Commission shall make a report to the President of its findings and conclusions (to be preceded by such interim reports as it may find desirable), and shall make such recommendations for legislative, administrative, or other action as it deems appropriate.

3. In carrying out its functions under this order, the Commission shall prescribe its own rules of procedure. The Commission may hold such public hearings and hear such witnesses as it may determine, and it may, in connection with matters relating to Federal employees, examine any and all records and files relating to individual cases in possession of any executive department or

agency. All executive departments and agencies of the Federal Government are authorized and directed to cooperate with the Commission in its work and to furnish the Commission such information and assistance, not inconsistent with law, as it may require in the performance of its functions. The Commission shall take appropriate measures to protect the security or confidential character of any security-classified information or information of a confidential nature submitted to it or examined by it.

4. The expenditures of the Commission shall be paid out of an allotment made by the President from the appropriation "Executive Office of the President—Emergencies (National Defense)". Such payments shall be made without regard to the provisions of (a) section 3681 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (31 U. S. C. 672), (b) section 9 of the act of March 4, 1909, 35 Stat. 1027 (31 U. S. C. 673), and (c) such other laws as the President may hereafter specify.

5. Thirty days after the presentation of its final report to the President, the Commission shall cease to exist unless the President shall otherwise direct.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

#### INFANTILE PARALYSIS WEEKS—PROCLAMATION BY GOVERNOR OF NEW YORK

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of a proclamation by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, designating the weeks of January 15-31 as Infantile Paralysis Weeks in New York State, as part of the Nation-wide March of Dimes drive to raise funds for the continuance of the battle against this dread disease.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### PROCLAMATION STATE OF NEW YORK, EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,

Albany.

The most dreaded of diseases are those which attack their victims without warning and without apparent cause. Such an affliction is poliomyelitis, which comes, as it were, like a thief in the night to attack those who are apparently full of health and vigor. The fear of this disease lurks in every American home. The worst of it is that most of its victims are young boys and girls. During the last 3 years it has laid low more than 100,000 people in our country. During the year 1950 alone more than 4,200 residents of New York were polio patients.

In coping with the local and national case load the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis has exhausted its funds available for the care of patients. This indispensable institution is now trying to replenish its treasury through the 1951 March of Dimes, in order that its great work may continue. Despite the gravity of the world situation we cannot neglect the health and welfare of our boys and girls.

Now, therefore, I, Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim the weeks of January 15-31 as Infantile Paralysis Weeks in New York State, and I urge the people of the State to recognize the gravity of this cause and cooperate to the limit of their ability.

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 11th day of January in the year of our Lord 1951.

THOMAS E. DEWEY.

By the Governor:

JAMES C. HAGERTY,  
Secretary to the Governor.

## EGG PRICES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to read a brief letter which I hold in my hand:

BUTTE, N. DAK., January 3, 1951.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER.

DEAR SIR: About 2 or 3 weeks ago my wife took a case of eggs—that is 12 dozen—at 40 cents per dozen and she got \$4.80.

Yesterday we took another 12 dozen of eggs, and we got \$3.12—it is only 26 cents a dozen. What is going on now? Whatever we buy in the store it is a terrible price for anything we buy. I feed oats to my chickens, and they eat 10 bushels of oats, and the price of oats is 75 cents per bushel. Is there anything that you can do about that?

Your friend,

PAUL NOVAK.

Mr. President, that letter bears out what I said on Monday about the price of eggs: That it is ridiculous to have the farmers receive 21 or 22 cents a dozen for eggs, whereas the consumer is obliged to pay anywhere from 70 cents to \$1 for a dozen.

I may say that I sent a copy of Mr. Novak's letter to Mr. Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture, on the 9th day of January. However, up to the present time I have not received a reply.

SPEECH BY GEN. CHARLES DE GAULLE ON THE PRESENT INTERNATIONAL CRISIS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there has come to my attention a speech on the present international crisis, recently delivered by Gen. Charles de Gaulle, at Nîmes, France. I regard General de Gaulle as one of the great figures of contemporary history. Whatever may be said of General de Gaulle, no one has ever doubted his courage and flaming patriotism. I do not agree with every line of his speech, but in its entirety it reflects a refreshing and inspiring will to resist communism.

General de Gaulle is a political figure today, but he is also a realist. This is demonstrated by his insistence that Germany be permitted to rearm and that Spain be brought into any plan for the defense of Western Europe. He also insists very vigorously that all the Atlantic Pact Nations, including his own beloved France, make a much greater contribution to the cause of resistance to Communist aggression than is contemplated under present plans.

I believe that his address is a notable contribution to the cause of human freedom, and casts a great deal of light upon the issues which are pending in the Senate at the present time. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY GEN. CHARLES DE GAULLE AT NÎMES, JANUARY 7, 1951

The battle raging in Korea and Tonkin has finally awakened the world. Rubbing their eyes, the free peoples perceive that the curtain has risen on the harsh light of danger.

Everywhere, in Washington and in Paris, in Rome and in London, in Bonn and in Madrid, the people are forced to give up this sleep on the edge of the abyss, this deliberate illusion, this artificial indifference in which they have been plunged for so long because

they were afraid to look the facts in the face.

In the full light of events the joyless games of political partisans seem lugubrious and ridiculous. The concessions made to those whose threats were feared, in the hope of appeasing them by granting them favors—these concessions, too, can be clearly seen for what they are, that is, absurd and ruinous. It is now clear that our only hope lies in strength and firmness.

We in France are also emerging from our torpor. We are beginning to move, despite the pressures to which we have been subjected, despite the drugs with which the present political regime has wished to put us to sleep. The instinct of life, the desire to act which have been stirring in the depths of the nation, are coming to the surface, as unmistakable signs show. Here is one such sign. Look around you today. Look at this immense gathering of French people here at Nîmes.

In truth, it is high time that on this side of the Atlantic, as on the other, we cease to dance a hesitation waltz. After so many councils, conferences, committees, plans, studies, and communiqués, it is high time that common action, without which everything might collapse, should really be prepared and organized. But within the whole everyone has his own special duty to perform.

Within the camp of freedom, there are different responsibilities on which the whole future depends and which the nation and the world must clearly understand. At this grave hour, surrounded by this anxious mass of Frenchmen called together at the appeal of the war veterans, I intend to say what these responsibilities are and how they are divided between the United States of America, Europe, and France.

As for our various responsibilities, it is on your shoulders, Americans, that the chief responsibilities rest. As a nation you are intact. As a power, no other possesses the means you possess. As a state, you stand upright, because up till now the circumstances have sheltered you from those misfortunes which destroy institutions.

On the great tablets of history on which the merits and mistakes of the nations are inscribed your name is now inscribed in first place. This is a privilege heavy to bear. We Frenchmen know this, for France was for a long time the chief champion of human freedom. Due to her trials, she can no longer suffice for this task. It is your turn. On the attitude you are now going to take in the drama in which we are all engaged will depend your fate—and to a large extent the fate of the rest of the world.

I appeal to you Americans to defend Europe. Europe needs you. You need Europe.

You no doubt say that Europe is troubled, bitter, divided. That is so. You no doubt say that none of the free nations of the old Continent have yet recovered their equilibrium. I agree. You no doubt say that despite the threat menacing all the European nations, one has to move mountains in order to get them to unite. That is true.

And yet, in spite of what you find uncertain and disconcerting in the old Continent, Europe is there; she exists, full of men and means, linked to your America by a thousand vital links, profoundly involved with Asia and Africa, conscious of her value to the point that today, in the midst of her anguish, she is sure that, in the ultimate outcome, the road the world will follow will be the road that she will have taken. Believe me, Europe being what she is, her salvation is the condition of your own salvation.

For despite its ruins, the old Continent contains immense resources.

In that part of Europe which remains free there are more men, women, and chil-

dren, more iron, coal, copper, aluminum, wheat, meat, and sugar than in Soviet Russia or in the United States of America. The capacities for work, for production, and for invention of our peoples have been absorbed in the work of reconstruction, but they do not remain any the less enormous for that.

Although their material losses, their moral depression, and their political confusion have so far prevented the rebirth of their armies, they possess a very vast war potential.

Let all that be used and the west will dictate the peace.

To allow the Soviet system to swamp the French, Germanic, Latin, and Scandinavian territories, even after having scorched them, would be to hand over to the Soviet system an incalculable additional source of strength.

And what a jumping-off ground it would be for the Soviet system for more distant conquests. I know full well that some who live on the periphery of the Western World apply the scale of the past to anticipations of the future, and reassure themselves by measuring the width of the Channel, the height of the Pyrenees, the distance to Morocco, and the width of the Atlantic Ocean. But if death and destruction cannot cross these geographical obstacles on foot, in automobiles, or in ships, they can cross them with flying missiles and on wings.

Above all, who can measure the shattering effect on the whole world which would result from the totalitarians becoming masters of Paris, Rome, Vienna, Berlin, and Istanbul? After this forward leap of the conquerors, what currents would carry away the masses in Asia? How, in their resulting confusion, would the Africans react?

In such an eventuality, the men and women of the New World would see the lights going out one after the other in all the windows of the earth while, among general maledictions, the Parthenon, the Coliseum, Notre Dame de Paris would crumble with the rest under their own bombs. Who knows whether in its isolation the New World would not itself be crushed by the terrible burden of war.

No. The camp of freedom must in no event and at no price lose what it still has of Europe. The priority is over here. This implies, evidently, that the Armed Forces of America must be built up with a view to flowing massively and without delay, if the need arises, to this side of the seas. It means that the eventual battle must be prepared on the most forward possible line and that powerful units must be put in place there right away.

What the masters of the Kremlin want to achieve by fixing the largest possible western forces in Asia and by demanding with loud shouts what they call the demilitarization of Germany, is to get America to leave our Continent. If their plan succeeded we should see their policy playing alternatively on the illusions and the fears of the European states abandoned to their fate. We should see them maneuvering from within these states and using the activities and the votes of the Separatists (Communists), the camouflage of the fellow travelers, the opportunism of the politicians, so that they would perhaps conquer the peoples of Europe through the disintegration of their political regimes. The first signs of this attempt are already visible in Paris.

But, on the other hand, what an electrifying effect rapid and powerful aid from across the Atlantic would have on the old Continent. For the whole world knows the courage of your American soldiers and the value of your American chiefs and you are proving it every day.

Then you would see the old values, which, armed with weapons, give nations good armies, flourish again on the ancient territory. Then you would see that sacred solidarity establish itself among the peoples of



the Continent which is today being suffocated by doubt.

But if American support must come to the aid of the Europeans, this aid does not have the function of relieving the Europeans of their own responsibilities, any more than it would be intended to infringe on their independence. It is above all up to the Europeans themselves to defend their Continent and one day to make the whole of it free again.

There is a great deal of talk of common defense, but nothing is being done, finally, to assure it. If common defense is to be anything more than an alibi for cabinet ministers, a puzzle for experts, a poster for the Council of Strasbourg, numerous grievances and mental reservations must be forgotten. To make common defense effective all the nations must participate in the effort, whatever the condition in which they find themselves and the internal conflicts which divide them.

At the stage we have reached any excommunications are ridiculous. Today free Europe risks being submerged from one day to the next, and this is really not the moment to prevent it from rallying all its forces. Whatever may be a man's opinions, for example, on the regime governing Spain, this proud and valiant people, whose territory is one of the essential dykes of the west, must be incorporated without delay in the western entity.

Whatever may have been from century to century on both sides of the Rhine the pain and the anger, it is a fact that Germany lies at the heart of Europe and that military cover on the Elbe demands the collaboration of the Germans. As for the Germans themselves, let them take their place without insisting too much on their alarms or their demands. Let them seize the opportunity which history has suddenly offered them. Let them restore to the old occident the chance the Emperor Charlemagne carried to the tomb with him.

To organize Europe we must take Europe as it is, that is to say, as a collection of peoples very distinct from each other, each having its own body, soul, and genius. Each must therefore have its own armed forces. Let us leave to the geometers the strange plans which claim to mix contingents from different countries in the same military units in order to fabricate a nonnational army. From where would the soldiers of this military Babel draw their virtues? A coalition must of course have a single system on the higher levels of command, but the principle dominating everything is that an army fights for its country under the authority of its government and under the orders of its own chiefs. None of the armies, and I repeat none, which Europe must supply could possibly be created or used on any other terms.

As soon as a solid and resolute system is born on the Continent, the tendency toward insularity, which is sometimes imputed to Great Britain, can and should disappear. Thus it was, for the glory of Britain, when from 1914 to 1919, her armies fought without reserve and to the full alongside our own, or when in the recent war, they participated on a large scale in the Allied enterprise.

On the other hand, Dunkerque was the bitter fruit of a badly coordinated and last-minute strategy. Tomorrow, neither the safety offered by the English Channel nor any illusory African profits to be reaped in the catastrophe would prevent the British Isles from being involved in the disaster of our own collapse. As much as ever, Europe counts firmly on England.

But it is our own Nation which above all must give the example in order to bring about the revival of the Old Continent. There lies the responsibility of France. I know that too many people among us compare our relative former power with that which the vicissitudes of history have left

us, and take refuge in passivity and in saying "What is the good?" Those who do and say that understand nothing of their own country nor of the period in which we live. Worse still, they make worse the position which appalls and desolates them by preventing France from playing her role and by delivering her to the influence of others.

Once before we have witnessed a similar state of mind and we have measured its cost to us. At that time the regime had not just been built following a terrible disaster. Today the demons of abandonment are at work at a time when our Nation is being offered the opportunity to influence the course of events decisively.

Surely we can stand up. We can create an army able to strike effectively which would be the essential part of the continental forces, with its 20 permanent divisions, plus 20 reserve divisions, its 5,000 planes, its 350,000 tons of modern warships, its young men of quality, its ardent and able chiefs. We can reestablish national unity by carrying out, through association of labor and capital, the great social and economic reform of the century. We can go ahead toward a direct understanding between the French and the Germans, from which will emerge the unity of Europe. We can make the part which belongs to us a matter of life and death. In our country, which works, produces and trades widely and which is not deprived of outside aid if it justifies it, we can solve without too many shocks the problems of the division of costs, credit, labor power, raw material, and food supplies, which our rearmament will constantly make heavier.

We can reestablish the credit of the state, this essential and traditional source for financing the cost of national defense, once it is established that an extraordinary and temporary effort is needed. Above all, we can regain our soul, that is to say, our faith and our hope.

Yes, we can do that. But on condition that a regenerated government at last leads the nation. The regime, constructed 4 years ago amid boundless confusion by the political parties working for themselves, is condemned by events. As events get worse, the confusion and the impotence of the system gets worse too. Its principle is to form the government by the juxtaposition of political cliques and rivalries. Its type of action is to oppose groups of electors to each other, and that very fact prevents it from ever identifying itself with the French community. All this, and the fact that the regime feels it has been disavowed by the nation renders it incapable of facing the terrible problems which press on us from all sides.

In all fields, the regime drags itself from one compromise to another, offering its weakness to the temptation of the totalitarians, puzzling its allies with its enigmas, and alarming the country, which is less worried about being in danger than about being leaderless.

What a pity it is, in these times, to see many a man of value getting engulfed in these quicksands. If, even within this regime, their conscience and their reason succeeded in overcoming the sectarianism of the cliques, the republic would quickly be restored to its real function which is to be the state for the sole benefit of the nation, and to its proper purpose which is that of the public welfare. A government based on the unity of the French people, above parties, which would call on the people to rally around France and would obtain by democratic elections the ardent approval of the country, would be able to carry out the needed reforms of our existing institutions, to put the country on its feet and lead it toward its destiny.

I have already said this is the north, and I repeat it here in the south. For my part, I am ready, fully ready. Failing this, the consultation of the nation, which must take

place this year, unless there is an act of usurpation, will decide the question, despite all trickery, by calling to account those who hang on to this system of sterility and who have thrown away for nothing some of the nation's trump cards.

The hour of responsibility has struck. In the battle now engaged between light and darkness, and which can bring war and catastrophe to the weak or assure life and peace to the strong, may America, may Europe, may France, together do their duty. Long live France.

#### THE FEDERAL OLEOMARGARINE LAW—REPORT OF SURVEY BY DAIRY ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a release which I have prepared giving my views on the subject of America's dairy industry in relation to the oleomargarine threat. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my release be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point, to be followed thereafter by the text of a special report of a survey by three great dairy organizations, pointing out violations under the new oleo law.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have before me a copy of the survey referred to by the Senator from Wisconsin, made on behalf of the American Butter Institute, the National Creameries Association, and the National Milk Producers Federation. It had been my purpose to ask that it be printed in the RECORD, but since the Senator from Wisconsin has made such a request I do not, of course, desire to have a duplication in the RECORD.

I may say, however, that the survey made on behalf of the three leading butter and dairy institutes of America in relation to prevalent restaurant practices in the sale of spreads for bread discloses the startling circumstance that the overwhelming majority of the restaurants visited by the investigators served oleomargarine in violation of the law without notice or advice to the purchasing public.

The survey also discloses, I am proud to say, that there were no violations observed in the State of New York, where production of oleomargarine in imitation of butter is prohibited.

Of course, I shall not object to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

There being no objection, the release by Mr. WILEY and the report of the survey were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### WILEY URGES THREE ACTIONS TO PROTECT UNITED STATES DAIRYING—SAYS PREDICTIONS OF HARM TO BUTTER INDUSTRY FROM NEW OLEO LAW ARE STARTING TO BE BORNE OUT

"American dairying must be aided by three specific Federal and State actions," Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, stated today, "if the Oleo Trust is to be prevented from causing lasting damage."

The Wisconsin legislator contended that "the artificial supply and demand for food products during the present defense effort may have blinded some folks to the real facts. Thus, the new oleo law has already severely harmed dairying although that fact is not generally understood. Just look at farm papers and see the auction sales being conducted on dairy farms."

The Wisconsin legislator had led the fight for the butter amendment to the oleo bill—a battle which ended in January 1950 with the temporary defeat of the dairy forces.

#### SENATE SHOULD STUDY OLEO MONOPOLY

WILEY accordingly urged new action which he reported could "only partly help the present situation," as follows:

1. He recommended that the Senate take action on a bill which will shortly be reintroduced by Senator LEHMAN, Democrat, of New York, with cosponsorship by Senators from Wisconsin and other dairy States. Purpose of the resolution is to secure an investigation by the Senate and the Federal Trade Commission of the monopolistic character of the oleomargarine industry. "The FTC," said WILEY, "should also investigate unfair trade practices by that industry."

"In addition, it should review the loopholes in the oleo law which Congress passed last year. Under that law, oleo manufacturers were supposed to have been prevented from giving readers of newspaper ads or leaflets the impression that they were selling a natural dairy-type product when actually an artificial product was being sold. That restriction against such improper advertising has, however, been shown to be shot through with wide loopholes."

#### WILEY URGES STATES TO PROTECT BUTTER

2. Senator WILEY also issued an appeal to 14 State legislatures "to beat down the oleo trust's latest legislative efforts, to destroy butter." "These are the last 14 commonwealths which prohibit the sale of yellow-colored oleo. A determined effort is being made this year to repeal these 14 State statutes. If oleo is allowed to masquerade as butter in those States, then the dairy industry will have been that much further severely harmed."

"Some pro-oleo bills that are being or have been introduced would authorize so-called identification of oleo in restaurants as well as authorizing other half-baked, impractical measures. Yet, we have seen that these so-called restaurant safeguards against false identification are a farce."

#### PRO-OLEO FEDERAL LAW SHOULD NOT BE USED AS MODEL

"In many State legislatures the cry for repeal of the present butter statute is being made on this basis: 'Let us pattern a new State statute along the lines of the new Federal pro-oleo law.' I trust, however, that the State legislatures will not listen to that dangerous appeal. Why? Because the Federal law instead of being something that should serve as a model, is actually unfair, impractical and practically unenforceable. The oleo lobby even succeeded in knocking out the few minimum safeguards which we had proposed in it such as triangular identification of all retail oleo."

#### ENFORCEMENT FUNDS NECESSARY

3. WILEY stated that he will insist that Congress increase appropriations to the Pure Food and Drug Administration to try to tighten enforcement of the mislabeling law. He pointed out that some \$6,000,000 was originally requested for enforcement of the law, only \$200,000 of which was actually ultimately granted by the Congress. "Such a pitiful sum," he said, "constitutes no enforcement whatsoever. It is ridiculous to place a law on the statute books and to fail to provide appropriations necessary to enforce it."

#### DAIRY PREDICTIONS HAVE BEEN BORNE OUT

WILEY stated that experience under the oleomargarine law confirmed predictions which he and other dairy spokesmen had made during the battle on the floor of the Senate.

"1. As predicted, the sale of white oleomargarine has practically disappeared. Thus, in 1948, only 10 percent of the oleo which was sold was yellow. In 1949, that percentage had increased to 30 percent, and last year the percentage increased to around 70 percent. We all know that the oleo industry shed crocodile tears in its alleged love of folks in the low-income brackets. Now, however, do we find that the oleo industry is concentrating on the sale of the inexpensive white product? On the contrary, it is concentrating on selling the yellow product which sells for more and gives it more profit. This proves the falsity of the oleo industry's claims."

"2. As predicted, the price of oleo has tremendously increased. It is a fact, of course, that there has been a general price rise throughout our entire economy and that the prices of the component oils in oleo have also increased. Nevertheless, the monopolistic character of the oleo industry makes its product particularly susceptible to price manipulation by the few manufacturers who control it."

#### "DAIRYMEN ARE SWITCHING TO OTHER FARMING

"3. As predicted, there is more and more of a tendency for dairy farmers to sell their herds in order to turn to more types of farming with greater financial appeal. While income to dairymen has increased, it has not increased as fast as have the costs of farm machinery, farm labor, etc. Moreover, if the dairyman's income does not increase as fast or faster than income received by other segments of American agriculture, there will be a greatly speeded tendency to turn from dairying to other types of farming. It must never be forgotten that there is no single type of farming which is more beneficial to the health of the Nation's population and the health of the Nation's soil than is dairying."

In making these comments, Senator WILEY emphasized, "I am not speaking merely as the senior Senator from America's Dairyland, Wisconsin, but rather I am speaking for the welfare of the present and future generations of Americans whose health depends upon a healthy dairy industry."

#### SURVEY BY DAIRY ORGANIZATIONS UNCOVERS FLAGRANT VIOLATION OF NEW FEDERAL OLEO LAW

The new Federal oleomargarine law is being "flagrantly violated on a scale not equaled since the days of Federal prohibition of alcohol," three national dairy organizations charged here today.

Speaking for the three organizations, the American Butter Institute, National Creameries Association, and National Milk Producers Federation, Charles W. Holman, federation secretary, declared that:

"Patrons of public eating places who order and pay for bread and butter in three States where yellow oleomargarine is legal, checked by researchers of an independent survey agency, are being illegally and fraudulently served the cheaper substitute without the notice specifically required by the Federal statute. The investigators sampled eating places in Atlanta, Macon, Savannah, Augusta, and La Grange, Ga.; Oklahoma City, Tulsa, Stillwater, and Ponca City in Oklahoma; Wichita, Topeka, and Manhattan in Kansas. They reported that 69 out of 109 eating places in those cities were serving a substitute spread when patrons ordered butter. Only 3 of the 69 complied with the Federal law requiring notice when the substitute is served."

"The investigators also checked the service of 'buttered' toast, and encountered an even more outrageous degree of fraud and violation of the law. Thirty-one out of 37 samples of 'buttered' toast picked up for laboratory analysis were found to be spread with a substitute."

At the same time, the three organizations reported that spot checks in two States (New York and Illinois) where the sale of yellow oleomargarine is banned showed satisfactory compliance with the Federal law in such States.

Holman emphasized that dairy farmers were not critical of efforts of the Federal Food and Drug Administration to enforce "an impossible law." He recalled that the Food and Drug Administration estimated at least \$6,000,000 should be provided by Congress to enforce the statute, but that actually only \$200,000 has been made available to the Federal agency.

Commenting on the findings, Holman said, "the contrasting results of the surveys in the two groups of States prove beyond doubt the wisdom of retaining statutory prohibition of the sale and serving of colored oleomargarine now in force in 14 States. Such State laws should be backed by a ban on the shipment of yellow oleomargarine in interstate commerce to simplify the task of the Food and Drug Administration."

"In Albany and New York City, N. Y., and in Chicago and Springfield, Ill., States which prohibit yellow oleomargarine, our investigators collected 40 samples of bread and butter and discovered no violations of the Federal law. On the other hand, in the three States which have lifted the bars on yellow oleomargarine, the public is being gypped on a wholesale basis as is indicated by the finding that 66 of 109 eating places sampled were violating the Federal law."

"The findings justify the contention that dairy farmers have been advancing to Congress and the State legislatures. Farmers have never objected to the sale of a product which is sold on its own merits. They rightfully can protest allowing a product to steal the table spread market by deception, fraud, and through open violation of the Federal law."

(There follows a summary of the methods and findings of the surveys:)

#### BACKGROUND OF THE SURVEYS

The three organizations authorized the surveys to ascertain whether the Federal law, which went into effect July 1, 1950, repealing the 10-cent tax on yellow oleomargarine, was actually being observed throughout the country. The investigator's method of procedure was to enter a restaurant that had no sign or notice concerning the service of oleomargarine and order bread and butter. The spread served was then placed into a refrigerated container and subsequently mailed to the laboratory for analysis. In approximately one-half of the cities, investigators ordered buttered toast and submitted the buttered toast samples for analysis. Affidavits testifying to their findings and reports of the laboratory tests are filed by the agency (Fact Finders Associates, Inc.).

The Federal law requires two types of identification or notice to consumers if an eating place served oleomargarine instead of butter. The eating place must either post a sign or notice on its walls or counters or publish this information on their menus. In addition, the eating places are required to serve the oleomargarine in a triangular pat or place a notice on the plate or tray from which the consumer is served the spread.

In the case of the 69 eating places serving oleomargarine without publishing a wall or counter notice, three did state on their menus that oleomargarine was used. Thus, 66 out of the 109 eating places flagrantly violated the Federal statute. With regard to the requirements for notice with individual servings, the investigators reported a somewhat better degree of compliance. Thirty-two of the 69 eating places serving oleomargarine in place of butter furnished the spread in triangular pats.



## FINDINGS IN THE CITIES

The following were the results city by city:

	Number of places sampled	Violations of Federal law
Kansas:		
Wichita.....	5	2
Topeka.....	17	5
Manhattan.....	7	4
Oklahoma:		
Oklahoma City.....	9	39
Tulsa.....	10	5
Stillwater.....	8	38
Ponca City.....	8	7
Georgia:		
Atlanta.....	10	4
Savannah.....	10	5
La Grange.....	8	6
Augusta.....	11	8
Macon.....	6	4
New York:		
New York City <sup>1</sup> .....	15	0
Albany.....	5	0
Illinois:		
Chicago <sup>2</sup> .....	15	0
Springfield.....	5	0

<sup>1</sup>100 percent violation.

<sup>2</sup>2 restaurants in New York City and 2 in Chicago were found to be serving a substitute spread on "buttered toast."

#### CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] I report from the Senate Committee on Armed Services numerous routine nominations and promotions. It would eliminate a considerable printing bill if the Senate could now, as in executive session, confirm the appointments, and I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I did not quite catch the Senator's statement regarding the nominations.

Mr. RUSSELL. They are various routine nominations and promotions in the regular military establishment. The purpose of asking that they be considered now, without going to the Executive Calendar, is that we may save a printing bill of approximately \$200. I can assure the Senator from North Dakota that this is in accordance with the custom which has been followed lately. The list does not show the home States from which the nominees come, but they are all nominations in the armed services, and, being familiar with the contribution of North Dakota to the defense of the country, I doubt not that some of the higher promotions affect citizens of North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. May I inquire whether the vote of the committee was unanimous?

Mr. RUSSELL. The nominations were ordered reported unanimously by the committee.

Mr. LANGER. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the armed services are confirmed en bloc. Without objection, the President will be notified immediately.

#### ASSIGNMENT OF GROUND TROOPS FOR SERVICE IN EUROPE

##### I. SENATE RESOLUTION 8

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the provisions of Senate Resolution 8, which has been referred to the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations, have been clarified to a great extent by the press and by certain periodicals throughout the country. The over-all issue which is to be determined by the Congress is this: That no ground forces of the United States should be assigned to duty in the European area until such a policy is approved by the Congress. Shall the President make commitments to send our American boys to become a part of an integrated international army, without the approval of Congress?

Members of the Senate, that issue will be determined upon the floor of the Senate when the Joint Committees of the Armed Services and Foreign Relations report back for consideration their recommendations on the subject matter of Senate Resolution 8.

##### II. THE RESOLUTION MAY BE AMENDED

While it is true that the joint committee may report Senate Resolution 8 favorably, or unfavorably, or with amendments, or may report a resolution of their own, the subject matter of the provisions of Senate Resolution 8 will, in the final analysis, be determined by the Members of the Senate. It is my position that the subject matter cannot be avoided.

As I said on Tuesday, January 16, when I presented the resolution and explained it, I had no pride of authorship. It was perfectly agreeable to me for anyone to amend the resolution insofar as the phraseology was concerned; but the subject matter, which involves the great overriding issue, as to whether the President can commit the Congress, and thereby, the United States, without congressional approval, must be included for a vote of the Senate.

While the resolution may be stripped of some of its words or of its sponsor's name, and regardless of whether a new resolution is brought to the Senate by the joint committee—and certainly it makes no difference how many more resolutions are submitted, or how many amendments are made—the issue here is embodied within the provisions of Senate Resolution 8. The issue is that Congress must make the determination whether Congress will permit the President to commit the people of the United States to an integrated army in Europe without the approval of Congress, and also that Congress should assert its right to put limitations on the sending of United States ground forces to the European area for the purposes of the North Atlantic Treaty.

The whole issue boils down to the question of whether the Congress shall be a full-fledged partner with the President in this new and very high policy, by officially considering his recommendations, whatever they may happen to be.

So, plainly, the resolution is just as much alive today as it was when it was offered, and as it will be when the subject matter of its provisions is debated

and discussed on the floor of the Senate in the near future.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is reported to have said that the Wherry resolution was "ridiculous," that it would be consigned to the Foreign Relations Committee, and that it would be sidetracked.

He was further reported to have said that he would bring out an affirmative resolution from the committee, broadly declaring that the Senate favors sending ground forces to Europe for an international army, but not stating there must be no commitment of foot soldiers until the Congress declares a policy on the matter.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not use that language. I did say that the committee would bring out a substitute; but so far as the word "sidetracked" is concerned, I made no such statement.

Mr. WHERRY. I am giving the report as it came over the radio, and I am sure that when we get the transcript it will be found that the Senator used those words. But I am glad to hear that he will not sidetrack the resolution. I think that shows fine statesmanship on the part of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I am sure the matter will be given every consideration.

The Senator from Texas was reported further to have said that he would bring out an affirmative resolution.

A story in the New York Times of Thursday, January 25, from a Times correspondent in Washington says:

After a long meeting of the Senate Democratic Policy Committee, which forms the party's leadership, its chairman, Senator ERNEST W. McFARLAND, of Arizona, announced that foreign policy has been discussed "in every aspect."

He made it clear that the President's Senate supporters expected the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees, which will meet shortly to prepare a proposed Senate declaration on the troop issue, to bring out nothing but an affirmative statement in no way restricting the President.

That is the issue. Do we want to restrict the President, or do we not?

Yesterday, however, the distinguished majority leader made a statement after the Democratic policy meeting, which lasted for several hours, on the subject of foreign policy.

The United Press ticker in the Senate cloak room carried the following report of that meeting:

Senate Democratic leaders discussed foreign policy issues today but agreed that congressional decision must await the forthcoming report of General Eisenhower. After a meeting of the Senate Democratic policy committee, Democratic Leader McFARLAND told reporters that the group discussed foreign policy but reached no conclusion. He said, "General Eisenhower will address House and Senate Members February 1 and appear in a closed session before the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees that afternoon." McFARLAND believes Eisenhower will appear before the corresponding House committees the next day.

"We are hopeful that the committees will bring in an affirmative resolution," McFARLAND said.

Asked if he meant a resolution to approve the assignment of troops, he replied that he could not say what it should be.

No doubt the reason why the distinguished majority leader made the observation that he would have to wait and see, is because of the great issue involved.

I think the Senator made an intelligent statement. He, himself, of course, is, I think, taking the position that we must wait and see whether the President, without congressional approval can make a commitment and determine the policy; that we should wait and see if the Democratic conference wants to bring out a resolution that Congress must approve what the President recommends before any troop commitment is made. I want to compliment the Senator on his statement.

Is it enough to report a resolution simply saying the Senate favors sending ground forces to Europe?

The question is, Who is to decide the number and set the pattern? Is it to be the President or Congress, or both the President and Congress?

Shall the President make such commitments or shall the Congress of the United States determine that policy?

That is exactly what is embodied in Senate Resolution 8. It provides that no commitment of ground troops shall be made until the Congress adopts a policy respecting the matter. That requires the legislative process.

That is the issue before the country. So, whether or not the Wherry resolution, word by word, or phrase by phrase, comes back to the Senate, the underlying issue which inevitably must be determined is whether or not the President shall commit the Nation to such a course without the approval of the Congress, or whether the Congress shall insist that the Executive must submit for its approval commitments he intends to make, to provide an integrated international army in Western Europe.

As I understand, the Senator from Texas wants the Congress to permit the President alone to determine the policy of how many foot soldiers, their location, and everything that goes into this program, including barracks, transports, and servicing of the troops should be committed.

The Senator from Texas wants it all left to the determination of the President. In taking that position now he would scrap the procedures prescribed in the North Atlantic Treaty and the assurances given to the Senate when that treaty was ratified.

The senior Senator from Texas would let the President alone determine our whole national defense policy, since the whole policy revolves around the matter of sending ground troops to Western Europe.

However, there are other Senators who have expressed themselves that while they would agree to send a limited number of ground troops to Europe, they feel the Congress should determine the limitations, as provided in the so-called

Wherry resolution. Many Senators have expressed that thought to me.

So, once again I want to suggest to the Members of the Senate that this subject matter is included in the provisions of Senate Resolution 8, which specifically provides that no commitments shall be made until the Congress determines the policy.

The junior Senator from Nebraska, as the author and sponsor of Senate Resolution 8, is moved to make these observations in the interest of clarifying further the issue as he sees it.

Undoubtedly the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, which are now jointly considering Senate Resolution 8, will look into all the ramifications of this great issue. The junior Senator from Nebraska has confidence in the wisdom of the members of the Foreign Relations and Armed Services committees. Twenty-six Senators will be called upon to hold hearings and to investigate the situation in reference to this basic issue.

In conclusion, I want to suggest that the question confronting the Senate is divided into two parts: First, it must be determined whether Congress is to have jurisdiction over the question of whether there shall be commitment of American boys to the peacetime international army in Western Europe; second, after it is decided that Congress does have the right to fix the policy, as contemplated in the North Atlantic Treaty, the merits of whether ground troops shall be sent then should be gone into exhaustively.

Obviously, all our debate on the subject will be pointless if the President alone is to do all the deciding, and the Congress becomes merely a rubber stamp to appropriate whatever sums of money he may deem to be necessary to finance the defense policy that he alone determines.

There should be thorough hearings, with all competent witnesses being called to testify. This is a tremendous question. It vitally affects every man, woman, and child in the land. Upon the determination of this issue rests our entire national defense efforts, taxes, controls, prices, and many other features.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand the Senator's speech, especially the last part of it, he states that there are two questions before the joint committee. The first question is whether or not article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty shall be redefined to include troops, as well as equipment. At the present time, according to the testimony of Secretary of State Acheson, article 3 is confined to equipment. The issue which the Senator from Nebraska brings before us is whether or not, as a question of policy to be determined by Congress, article 3 shall be defined to include troops as well as equipment. If that question is answered in the negative by the joint committee, and the Senate supports the stand of the com-

mittee, article 3 would be left to mean equipment only. On the other hand, if the committee and the Senate should decide, as a matter of policy, that troops may be sent, as well as equipment, the subject will then have been decided as a matter of policy. That is the first question I am asking of the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to answer the first question. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, that that is the question which is involved. The question is, Are we to supply ground troops before an attack is made? That question comes under article 3. According to the report which was brought to the Senate by the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Iowa asked the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, the specific question as to what was meant by arms. He asked the Secretary of State whether it included manpower. I do not have the testimony before me, but, as I recall, the Secretary of State answered unequivocally that it did not mean manpower. All I am saying is that there are two steps. In other words, if such aid is to be given prior to an attack, and it includes ground forces, I think the Senate of the United States should be so advised and the Senate should make such a determination. The inclusion of ground forces would expand the provisions of article 3. Such an expanded program of aid would go beyond the provisions of article 3 of the North Atlantic Pact.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, if it is determined to send troops, and article 3 is to be interpreted to include them, the determination should be made by the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then the question is, How many men shall be sent?

Mr. WHERRY. That is the second question. I think that policy should be determined by Congress.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator mean Congress or the Senate?

Mr. WHERRY. Congress. I think the policy should be determined by Congress, because my feeling is that the question of limitation goes to the root of the subject, just as the question of sending any Armed Forces goes to the root of the subject. Whether or not we should send any men should be determined by Congress. If the number is to be limited, I think Congress should decide what the limitation should be. That question should not be left to the determination by the President of the United States. He can suggest the policy; can submit his proposals and recommendations; it is his function to do so; but after he has made his proposals and recommendations, it is the prerogative of Congress either to approve or disapprove any limitations which he may suggest.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the first question is determined in the affirmative, namely, that troops should be sent, do I understand that the Senator believes it would be the function of the joint committee to determine the second question, even though it would involve extensive hearings by the committee?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. I am not telling the committee what to do.



I did not suggest such a thing. All I am saying is that two steps are involved. Of course, the committee will do as it chooses. I have absolute confidence in the committee. However, I would answer the question of the Senator in the affirmative.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In listening to the Senator's remarks, I wonder whether he would clarify one or two points for us. As I understand, the Senator is now speaking about the so-called peacetime forces which would be sent to Europe.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator raises no question, in the event of aggression by the Soviet Union against the North Atlantic Pact signatories, on the general theory that an attack upon one is an attack upon all?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In the event of aggression, the President, acting under the obligations of the North Atlantic Pact, could send troops?

Mr. WHERRY. I certainly feel that in such event the President should invoke the provisions of article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty, which specifically sets forth his duties in such circumstances. Article 5 deals with an entirely different situation. The resolution does not go to article 5. In the event of an attack on any signatory to the pact we are committed to come to its aid.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think it is important to make that point clear, so that members of the North Atlantic Pact will not get the impression that there is any attempt on our part to renege on the provisions of the North Atlantic Treaty.

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad the Senator from California has brought out that point. It is not the purpose of the Senator from Nebraska to suggest that we should waver in any way on the policy of Congress. We ratified the treaty. Under the treaty, if a country is attacked we are absolutely obligated to come to its defense. Such procedure is provided under article 5. Article 3, on the other hand, speaks of the aid which is to be given prior to an attack. The whole question of aid is dealt with in article 9, which sets up an advisory board, consisting of the North Atlantic Pact countries, and under article 11 it is to be carried out in accordance with constitutional processes.

Senate Resolution 8 brings the whole subject matter under discussion. The issue is, Shall the President extend the provisions of article 3 by sending men? If he believes he has the right to do so, the next question is, How many men should be sent? My contention is that instead of letting the President determine the policy, and thus extending the provisions of article 3, he should submit his proposals to Congress through legislative committees. The Senate should then decide whether there is to be an extension of article 3. If men are to be sent, the next question is, What limitation shall be placed on the number of men to be sent?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In addition to our obligations under the North Atlantic Treaty, which was ratified by an overwhelming number of the members of this body, we also are in the position of an occupying power in Germany, the state of war not having been ended. Does the Senator from Nebraska agree that in carrying out our duties as an occupying power the President has the right to send troops to Germany, either to replace troops, or, in the event the security of the American forces is involved, to re-enforce them to such an extent as military necessity may require?

Mr. WHERRY. I am in total agreement with the President as to his right and power in that respect. I think it is an entirely different subject. It is up to the President to decide whether more or fewer troops are required for that purpose.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator would agree, would he not, that unless there is some kind of wide flanking movement of Russian aggression in Europe, the only way the Russians could get to France, Belgium, or the Netherlands would be by going through the American occupying forces in Germany, and in such event we would be immediately precipitated into hostilities with the Soviet Union, even without the North Atlantic Pact?

Mr. WHERRY. There can be no doubt about that. It would be a matter of how to meet the invasion, or to protect our interests in Germany. We would be on an entirely different footing in such event than we are now faced with under the proposal to extend article 3. I thank the Senator from California for asking his questions. They are pertinent and will help to clarify the resolution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to make one comment. I think the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, acting as chairman of the joint committee, was quite correct in feeling that action should not be taken on another resolution until General Eisenhower had an opportunity to report because what we need more than anything else at the present time are facts upon which to base sound judgments.

There is some difference of opinion, which has been raised, as to the constitutional power of the Executive to send troops in peacetime which are not intended for the specific purpose of protecting American lives, as has been done on numerous occasions in the past. There is some question as to the authority of the Commander in Chief to send a peacetime army whose operations might extend over a long period of years. Some think he has the power and some question whether he has such power. But does the Senator from Nebraska feel that, regardless of whether that power exists under the broad terms of the Constitution, with the difference of opinion in the country and in the Congress, the President would be well advised to consult with the Congress in the matter of the permanent establishment of an occupying force in Europe

under the terms of the North Atlantic Pact?

Mr. WHERRY. I certainly would answer "yes" to that question. I feel that the same position should be taken here as was taken on the question of the submission of the implementation of the United Nations Charter relative to the forces to be furnished in the event a mandate were issued by the Security Council. The whole question was discussed as to whether the United Nations could use our forces without referring the matter back to the Congress to obtain its approval. I think the Senator remembers the debate. I am sure that the Senator will remember that in the course of the debate a message came from President Truman, who was then attending a conference at Potsdam, to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. The President stated in his message that it might be announced by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, in effect—I do not remember the exact words—that the President would seek the approval of Congress, regardless of his constitutional power. In the report of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, if I correctly recall, the statement was made by the distinguished chairman in the very last paragraph that, regarding the question of whether the President has the right or does not have the right, it should be settled once and for all that the proposed action will be submitted for the approval of Congress.

While the present situation is not exactly the same, yet so far as concerns the policy relating to the implementation of the North Atlantic Treaty under section 3, before an attack, whether the President of the United States has the authority or does not have the authority, for the good of the united foreign policy I believe it would be acceptable to the Congress if the President would submit his recommendations, whether or not he feels that he has certain constitutional authority, and have the Congress go along as a full-fledged partner.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator. I felt that it was necessary to clarify the situation to some extent, because there has been great misunderstanding in some quarters in Europe, both among our friends and among potential aggressors. There has been the feeling that perhaps there was some major movement to renege on the provisions of the North Atlantic Charter.

Mr. WHERRY. No.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator very ably brought out that that was not in his mind, and that we are prepared to assume our full obligations under the treaty. We have given our word.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think it is also important for potential aggressors to recognize the fact that, while in the Senate we may disagree from time to time, and we may disagree across the aisle, when, as my old New England grandmother used to say, our righteous indignation is aroused, the Congress of the United States can solidify very

quickly, as can the American people. I think that was demonstrated in the vote of the Senate the other day, of 91 to 0, when we had finally been pushed to the point where the moral sensibilities of the American people were shocked by what had taken place. Without a dissenting vote, either Democratic or Republican, the United States Senate was a unit. I think if there is aggression in Europe, that same solidification, both in Congress and among the American people, will take place. I hope the Soviet Union recognizes that.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for his observation.

#### ACCESS BY DREW PEARSON TO CERTAIN SECRET DOCUMENTS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina obtained the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from South Carolina be permitted to yield to me to read into the RECORD three letters, and that the Senator from South Carolina not lose the floor because of so yielding.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to read into the RECORD three letters which I think should be of considerable interest to the Senate and to the Department of Justice.

The first letter is dated January 13, 1951, and reads as follows:

JANUARY 13, 1951.

Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR McCARTHY: This letter is unofficial and confidential. I trust you will treat it as such. However, it contains information which I think should be fully explored.

I am an officer working in the intelligence section of the far eastern command. There has been forwarded to us copies of articles by Drew Pearson in which he quotes from secret documents prepared in this intelligence section. One of the documents which concerned us greatly was contained in Mr. Pearson's column of December 30 in which he quotes from, and identifies by date, document 3019, dated December 6, 1950. The quotes are accurate, and the date given by Mr. Pearson was accurate. It proves beyond a doubt that someone has been handing secret documents to Mr. Pearson. Whoever did this knew that he was violating our espionage laws because I have since checked and find that the document from which Mr. Pearson quoted, had stamped upon it in large red letters the warning that if made public, it would be of benefit to the enemy, and that transmitting or revealing this information to any unauthorized person would be a violation of the Espionage Act.

This article properly identified the Chinese Communists units which were arrayed against us. It is of course of tremendous value for the Communists to know just how much information we have about them. Such information is of great value to their counter-intelligence units. For example, if someone would publish for our benefit just exactly what Chinese intelligence knew about our units, it would save the lives of many of our men. Those of us like myself who have relatively safe jobs in intelligence work, as well as our people who are risking their lives

daily behind the enemy lines, feel that Mr. Pearson and whoever stole these secrets for him are guilty of high treason.

We cannot understand the inactivity of the Congress, the Justice Department and the Army in not starting criminal action against this man. While we are concerned with the publication of this one document, we are a thousand times more concerned with the fact that this means that Mr. Pearson has unlimited access to military secrets. It means also that there is a spy handling our military secrets, secrets obtained at great hazard and in many cases the expenditure of lives.

Incidentally, we noted that while Mr. Pearson correctly quoted the dispatch listing the six Chinese armies, he then proceeded to do a job of addition and multiplication which should embarrass a child in kindergarten. In order to make the Chinese Communists look braver and better fighters than our men, he stated that the six armies contained only 96,000 Communist soldiers.

I may say at that point that any private who has been in the Army 2 or 3 days, knows that one army contains more than 96,000 soldiers, let alone six armies.

Hope this information may be of some value to you.

Very sincerely,

In view of the fact that this intelligence officer had stated that this letter was confidential and could not be used, I wrote to him on January 16, 1951, as follows:

JANUARY 16, 1951.

DEAR —: This is to acknowledge and thank you for your letter of January 6. I shall, of course, keep this information in strictest confidence if you so desire. However, it would be of considerable value if I could read your letter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that it could be brought to the attention of the other Senators. This could be done omitting your name.

I would very much appreciate receiving your permission to do this by wire collect.

As stated above, if you desire this to remain confidential, I shall certainly respect your wishes.

Sincerely yours,

JOE McCARTHY.

On the 22d of January 1951, Mr. President, I received the following letter from the same officer:

JANUARY 22, 1951.

DEAR SENATOR: Your letter of the 16th finally caught up with me. I would have replied, as you requested, by telegram but I am not certain of the integrity of such a communication.

Steps should, and must, be taken to stop such leaks of secret information. It is obvious, to me at least, there is a clique who desire to undermine the prestige and power of General MacArthur. To the troops in the field I know this campaign has had a shattering morale effect. When I see our fighting men being betrayed it sickens me.

You may use my letter in the RECORD if you will do the following things for me: (1) guarantee my name will never be revealed; (2) return to me by registered mail the original copy of my letter with this letter.

Good luck in your efforts to stop this "leak."

Sincerely,

#### FEDERAL MANPOWER POLICY

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, it has been 7 months since the Communists marched into Korea. This afternoon I desire to review what has happened to employment in our Federal Government in that short period, to look ahead and forecast what is in

prospect, and to make a recommendation on the manpower problem in Government that will be of interest to all our people.

At the end of June 1950, when the Reds invaded Korea, the records of the Civil Service Commission showed that we had 1,967,111 Federal workers in the executive branch of the Government. Of that number, 753,149 were in the Defense Department—the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The latest report made by Civil Service, for the month of November, shows the total number in the executive branch to have risen to 2,159,997, of whom 966,886 are in the Defense Department. That is a total increase of 192,886. The over-all increase in the Defense Department, however, is 213,737.

Reductions which offset some of the increase in the Defense Department were made in the Commerce, Interior, and Agriculture Departments. But these reductions were in seasonal and temporary personnel—reductions that would have been made in any event. For example, the Department of Commerce has reduced its staff which is working on returns from its seventeenth decennial census. The Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior reductions were in their seasonal staffs—people who work during the summer months in the forests and on the public lands. These people will again be put back to work this coming summer.

My point is that there has been no actual decrease whatsoever, none that was not already planned, in employment in the nondefense agencies.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a breakdown by departments showing the increases in Federal jobs proposed by the President's Budget for 1952. It also shows reductions which are proposed to be made under the President's 1952 Budget. I ask that the breakdown may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair): Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

These are among the increases in Federal jobs proposed in the President's 1952 budget (all are approximate figures):

	Jobs
Post Office.....	20,000
Internal Revenue.....	2,500
Customs .....	300
State Department (about).....	3,000
Immigration and Naturalization Service .....	600
Geological Survey (Interior).....	500
Civil Aeronautics Administration.....	500
Commodity Credit Corporation.....	900
Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors' Insurance.....	1,000
Civil Service Commission.....	900
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	1,800

These few reductions are to be made under the President's proposed 1952 budget:

	Jobs
Reclamation Bureau.....	2,600
Maritime .....	800
Soil Conservation Service.....	600
General Accounting Office.....	900
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	600

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, since the last Civil Service report, for the month of November, I am reliably informed that the total Fed-



eral employment has increased about 55,000, which would make the over-all increase in Federal employment, since Korea, about 250,000 in seven short months.

In addition, we have reliable estimates that Federal employment will increase by perhaps another half million workers by June 30, 1952, 17 months from now. If that happens, the total increase in Federal employment since Korea would reach 750,000.

I believe we all realize that some increase in Federal employment, particularly in the Army, Navy, and Air Force, is and will be necessary to support our troops in Korea and elsewhere overseas. The Army, Navy, and Air Force have hired many thousands of civilian workers to manufacture munitions, to build and repair naval vessels, to store and load supplies, to man airfields, and so forth.

But I believe, too, that most of us here and the people in general are disappointed by the failure of the President to cut nondefense expenditures to the bone, by the failure of the Civil Service Commission to adopt a realistic and hard-boiled manpower policy for the Government, and by the failure of Federal agencies to transfer more of their experienced employees to the defense agencies where they are urgently needed at this particular time.

These are some of the problems I propose to discuss with the Senate this afternoon.

Senators will recall that in his state of the Union message the President called on Congress to cut nondefense expenditures, and we applauded him for his statement. He said the Government would have to forego some of the things which some of the agencies believed were necessary.

But the President failed to follow up his statements when he submitted his proposed budget for the 1952 fiscal year. I have examined that budget in detail. In only isolated instances did he propose fewer employees for the nondefense agencies. By and large, he submitted estimates to Congress which proposed either that these agencies retain their present staffs or that they be given increases in personnel. In other words, he has challenged Congress to carry out his expressed desire to cut nondefense spending. I believe we should accept that challenge.

A week ago the President made public his national manpower mobilization policy. I wish to quote two provisions contained in it. They are:

First. Each individual will be expected to serve in the capacity in which he can contribute most to the total mobilization program; and

Second. That the Government should assist workers to arrange for their transfer to essential jobs.

The central manpower agency for our Government is the Civil Service Commission. I am frank but sorry to say that it has done very little in developing plans to meet this situation. I often wonder if the Commission and its officials realize the gravity of the situation at this time.

As far back as last September the Congress itself, in an indirect manner, ex-

pressed its resentment at the do-nothing and feet-dragging attitude of the Civil Service Commission in regard to the acute manpower problem brought about by the Korean War.

At that time the Congress voted approval of a rider, written by Representative WHITTEN, of Mississippi, to a supplemental appropriation bill. The Whitten rider now requires the Government to place on a temporary basis most of its personnel actions, such as appointments, grade promotions, interagency transfers, and the like. It also sought to have nondefense agencies transfer some of their employees to the defense agencies.

If the Civil Service Commission had been aware of its responsibilities and had acted to meet the emergency situation in Government after the Korean invasion by the Communists, there would not be a Whitten rider. There would have been no necessity for it.

Mr. President, the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, which has honored me with its chairmanship, has a definite and clear-cut responsibility to see that the Civil Service Commission is prepared to meet this problem and is prepared to assume its responsibility in directing the manpower policy of this vast Government. We believe that the Senate committee must assist in working out a realistic policy. We must see to it that every person in the Government's employ is in a job which contributes most to the defenses of our Nation, that no agency has more employees than it needs, that red tape and regulations that make it difficult for experienced employees to transfer to the defense agencies are abolished.

I therefore propose, Mr. President, to appoint a special subcommittee, to be composed of seven members of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee—four Democrats and three Republicans, to make a detailed inquiry into civil-service policies, to examine the manpower needs of Federal agencies, and to hammer out a manpower policy for the Government for the duration of the emergency.

These are some of the problems into which I believe the special subcommittee should inquire:

Whether the personnel of nondefense agencies should be frozen at their present levels in order to give defense agencies their choice of the available workers.

To require old-line agencies which either have or will be given defense duties—such as Commerce, Agriculture, Interior, Interstate Commerce, Labor, and others—to handle their new duties by transferring employees from less essential work to them.

To give you an example of what I have in mind, Mr. President, let me say that we are now told that the Office of Economic Stabilization is hiring a large new staff to enforce a forthcoming order to freeze prices and wages. May I be permitted to make this suggestion: That the Office of Economic Stabilization be permitted to make use of the inspection staff of the Wage and Hour Division, as well as the inspection staffs of other Federal agencies, to help enforce its orders.

I am certain it could be done and would be both more economical and more efficient.

To draft a transfer policy, free of red tape and restrictions, that would encourage employees in the nondefense agencies to transfer to defense jobs.

To determine whether the time-consuming civil-service competitive tests are necessary during the emergency.

To examine promotion and appointment policies, to make certain they are streamlined to meet emergency conditions.

To spotlight Government programs and activities that can be set aside for the duration, in order to free employees in nondefense work for pressing defense needs.

To examine the possibility and cost of longer hours for more Government people, in order to save manpower, the costs of materials, and the office space which additional employees will require.

To go into the question of annual leave, to determine whether the rider adopted by the Eighty-first Congress to require employees to take by next June 30 leave earned during the 1950 calendar year, or else lose it, is now feasible. Also, adjustments in the leave system may also be considered.

To study the policies relating to the use of civilian and military personnel.

Why is it necessary to assign military persons to civilian positions to get the job done?

The concept of the military and civilian roles in waging a war underwent radical changes during World War II. Technological war, as contrasted to hand-to-hand fighting, resulted in only one in seven, or even fewer, of the military personnel getting into combat areas. The trend which started in World War II requires a new concept of the definition as to which are civilian and which are military positions.

There are fundamental advantages, in terms of cost, efficiency, stability, and disruption of lives, in having in civilian positions the greatest possible number of those who are engaged in the defense effort. If all positions which did not involve actual combat or combat planning and training for combat were filled with civilians, the result would be large-scale economies in both money and manpower.

There are many persons who are able to hold desk jobs, even though they cannot pass the physical examination required in order to qualify for service in the field with the military forces.

Conservatively, at least half of the positions in the National Military Establishment now filled by military personnel are in reality civilian positions. The average Government civilian costs approximately \$3,400 a year. The direct and indirect cost of a soldier in uniform is estimated to be at least \$5,000 a year, and some estimates place the cost as high as \$9,000 a year, when veteran and other indirect costs are included. Even if one-half the military positions were changed to civilian positions, there would be an annual saving of over one and one-half billion dollars, on a conservative estimate, and probably the savings would be several times this amount.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator's speech brings very clearly to our attention a problem now confronting the Nation. Is it not true that the men taken into the armed services are taken for the purpose of being able to fight for the United States, which is the purpose for which the Armed Forces are recruited. Therefore we give pensions and GI rights and similar benefits to those who are taken into the armed services, in which service they may be required to sacrifice their lives for their country. However, when military personnel fill civilian positions, they no more warrant such special treatment than do any of the civilians who hold jobs in Washington. Does not the Senator agree?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I certainly do; the Senator is entirely correct. Furthermore, let me point out that the dependents of persons in the military service—whether in the Army, Navy, or the Air Corps—will ask the Government for assistance, although their loved ones served in civilian positions, while actually in the military service.

Mr. FERGUSON. In fact, many military persons while holding such civilian positions wear civilian clothing, rather than military uniforms. Is that not true?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from South Carolina very much for the constructive suggestions he is making. I think they will result in very large savings to the Government and to the people of the United States.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in time of national emergency, the annual savings would be many, many times the \$1,500,000,000 I have mentioned. Since civilians form a more stable working force, such a change would result in widespread improvement in efficiency. Added savings would be made as a result of reductions in the number of positions required. Savings of other types would result from this work because of increased efficiency as a result of the use of such information in connection with the recruiting, pay, training, organizational planning, and other management processes.

The proposed special committee should also undertake to look into the policy of drafting Federal employees for active military service. I am told there is, after all this time, still no over-all Government policy in this regard.

To insist that Government supervisors and officials emphasize efficiency and economy in the administration of their offices; encourage and give their employees the incentive to do better work; save manpower; and cut operating expenses.

To determine whether the Federal Government has adequate machinery to bring into the Government people with the necessary know-how to do an effective mobilization job.

We have all been told many times how Government supervisors build up their staffs in order to justify larger salaries for themselves. Our committee considered this problem some months ago. At that time, our able colleague, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] proposed that employees and supervisors alike be rewarded in cash for economies initiated by them in their operations. The Long plan was incorporated in the bill which revised the Classification Act. That was 16 months ago. I was shocked recently to read an account of an address delivered by the Senator from Louisiana in which he pointed out that only a single award had been made under that provision. He asked whether those few employees were the only ones in the Government who were interested in economy. The Senator brought out that 40 percent of all Federal agencies have shown no interest whatsoever in his economy plan.

This situation brings to mind another major function and responsibility which will be placed on this subcommittee, that of keeping a careful watch on the agencies to see that they carry out the intentions of any congressional action taken. Some people have chosen to call this a "watchdog committee." I like that name. It has been very apparent that some agency officials have upon their staffs people whose sole function it is to find ways to circumvent the actions and intent of Congress.

These are only a few of the problems which come to mind for the special subcommittee to study. There will be others. Our Government is the Nation's largest employer. It must take the lead in forging a manpower policy which will get the most out of every employee in these perilous times when the future of our great Nation is at stake.

In the years I have had the privilege of serving on the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I have had frequent, almost daily, contact with Federal employees and their representatives. I am thoroughly convinced that the Government people themselves will unite in throwing their full support behind a program to place them in jobs where they will contribute more to the defense program and to their Nation. They are merely waiting to be led, to be told what to do, and how. Many of them, engaged in nondefense work, are impatient and are anxious to be of greater service to the country in her fight for our way of life.

From the detailed study I have been able to make of this problem, I am confident that at the end of 1952 we shall be able to show the Eighty-second Congress and the people of this Nation that we were able to pave the way for conservation of manpower, and to save the taxpayers many million dollars by getting the job done more efficiently, without the necessity of hiring hundreds of thousands of additional workers. To this end we dedicate our best efforts, and with the unqualified cooperation of the Congress, I am confident we shall, in the future, be able to show results.

I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference, a resolution to

provide funds for the necessary staffing and other expenses to assist this proposed subcommittee in carrying out this investigation.

There being no objection the resolution (S. Res. 53) was received and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed during the Eighty-second Congress to conduct a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the personnel needs and practices of the various departments and agencies of the Government, with a view to the formulation of policies for the most effective utilization of civilian personnel by such departments and agencies during the period of the national emergency. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations for necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

#### IMPENDING RUSSIAN VICTORY—RECOGNITION OF CHINESE RED PUPPET

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I have a statement to make regarding a grave situation. In a measure, it is a warning, because there is one possible alternative open to the American people.

Our enemy is about to be victorious, not in Korea, but on a global basis, not in 3 years or 1 year, but in the next few weeks, possibly days.

#### THE GOAL—30 YEARS' CONTINUOUS EFFORT

While we talk here of future preparation for war or defense, of spending all our substance, past, present, and future, on a big war machine, of putting the entire Nation on a war basis, our potential enemy goes easily along making daily progress toward his goal.

What is the enemy's goal?

Moscow's recent conquests in China are the culmination of 30 years of continuous, persistent, and far-ranging efforts. With continental China enslaved, it now has the immediate prospect of overrunning great additional areas in southern Asia with overwhelming force.

#### CHINA COULD MAKE THE DIFFERENCE

The thing that stands in her way now in her conquest of all Asia is the withholding of official world-wide recognition of her puppet regime of Chinese Communists.

The Senate has taken its stand—in the resolution passed Tuesday—against United Nations admission of the Chinese Communist regime. But, does anyone here think for a moment that the Senate resolution will change the minds and hearts of those—here and abroad—who have been working and conniving with the Reds?

For us in the present struggle, China free or China under the Soviets could mean the difference between victory and defeat.



What good the billions of dollars of appropriations, what good the sacrifices, what good the taking of our 18-year-old boys, what good the girding for world war III, if Russia can gain her goal through our diplomatic weakness?

#### DEFEATED BY OUR DIPLOMATS

What followed the world's worst war is the world's most dismal inability to achieve any kind of peace. We are being defeated by our so-called diplomats, and it looks as if they are going to sell us out long before we are prepared to wage war.

In my December 14 speech on the Senate floor, I listed 10 suggestions for our survival. I have discussed the first two. The third is the subject of my remarks today. On later dates I shall discuss the remaining suggestions in the list.

#### THE PROPOSED ADMISSION OF COMMUNIST CHINA TO THE UN

Suggestion No. 3 was:

Oppose the recognition of Communist China by the United Nations with every means at our command.

It is this vitally urgent matter to which I wish to address myself today.

#### THE PATTERN OF THE PLOT

The junior Senator from Nevada will hold up for all to see the pattern of the plot of which we are the victim. This examination will show, step by step, how we got into this mess, and will suggest a course of action by which we may be saved from the great and permanent defeat.

There are current rumors of a compromise settlement of the China and Korea questions before the UN which would involve seating the Communist delegates, and presumably letting the Chinese Republic's formal charges of aggression against the Soviet Union go by default.

There are so-called Americans in our Government service working for the admission of Red China to the UN and perhaps even diplomatic recognition by this country at the very time Chinese Reds are slaughtering American boys in Korea.

The disaster that has overtaken us—and a third world war, no matter what its outcome, is little short of a disaster—is due to the propaganda of socialistic, communistic, and internationalist elements in the United States.

Behind the insults the American people take almost daily in the United Nations the insidious propaganda for admission of Chinese Reds continues.

#### ENGLAND'S REAL POSITION DISCLOSED

When Prime Minister Attlee made his recent trip to Washington, the Senator now speaking said publicly that Attlee's chief interest was in the protection of British trade and that Attlee was, therefore, on the side of the United Nations' admission of the Chinese Reds. Following my remarks, Mr. Attlee issued a statement denying the charges, saying there could be "no thought of appeasement or of rewarding aggression."

The incongruity of that is apparent when one observes that England had officially recognized Communist China, and had not withdrawn that recognition. I stated at the time that the truth would eventually be revealed. Now, it has been,

through the statement which British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin submitted to the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference. Bevin listed six points regarding the far-eastern situation, the first of which was for recognition and admission of Communist China to the United Nations.

In the fall of 1949, when the Senate was discussing the conferences then being held on the subject of storing atomic bombs in England, this Senator warned that England, whom we had been keeping, would soon affront us by extending official recognition to the Chinese Communists.

England denied she would recognize the Chinese Communists; soon thereafter England did officially recognize them.

#### COMMUNIST WORLD PLANS

With the exception of small fellow-traveller minorities and their sympathizers, almost everyone agrees that Soviet communism has been planning world conquest systematically for decades.

The current behind-the-scenes actions of American Government officials in the interest of recognition of the Chinese Communists are part of a far-reaching plan, the pattern of which is clearly discernible to anyone who will only examine it.

The intellectual climate in the administration in the early days of the New Deal was a depressing compound of profound ignorance, wishful thinking, and impractical dreaming, all of which played into the hands of the group of individuals who consciously placed loyalty to the Kremlin above all other considerations.

Some of these succeeded in getting into key positions in our Government agencies. They were able to operate freely and were able to influence liberals of the world-saver and one-economic-world complex. One of Roosevelt's Vice Presidents, Henry Wallace, is an example of the latter class.

Pro-Sovietism was the party line of the administration. Under these circumstances, infiltration of strategic Government agencies by fanatical Soviet sympathizers encountered no difficulty. We were, and still are, plagued with the working of policies which were in the interest of foreign powers.

#### FESTERING SORES DO NOT HEAL IF COVERED UP

Mr. President, I am not one of those who believe we should keep quiet about past mistakes. They are festering sores which will not heal by being ignored. We are not going to build a strong structure on a rotten foundation. We are not going to straighten out a deplorable situation by trying to act as though it were not there. It is our duty to call the attention of the public to what is wrong in our Government. It is vital that we examine what has been done, because the men responsible are still in control.

#### THE COMMUNIST PATTERN—IN GOVERNMENT

World War II agencies were a haven for those whose first loyalty was to the Kremlin.

The OWI, Office of War Information, under Elmer Davis was ridden with fellow-travellers. Many of those selected

for good positions in the OWI were persons of foreign birth with political pasts suggestive of Communist sympathies. Some of our own Government offices thus conducted what could only be termed pro-Soviet propaganda.

After the war at least three employees of OWI, a Mr. Herz, a Mr. Arsky, and a Miss Balinska, appeared in the service of the Communist regime in Poland. They should have been on the payroll of Stalin instead of our payroll. Another person in the Office of War Information, a Miss Annabelle Bucar, went to Moscow after the war and renounced her American citizenship.

Articles by former employees of OWI critical of American and favorable to Soviet policy have appeared in various magazines.

Other Government agencies have had their quota of bad security risks, as has been brought out in various investigations.

Alger Hiss is not the only high official who has been exposed as pro-Communist. Julian Henry Wadleigh, another former State Department official, confessed his guilt as a Soviet spy.

Harry Dexter White, a high Treasury official and principal author of the Morgenthau plan, mentioned by many as being pro-Soviet, committed suicide while under investigation. Carl Aldo Marzani was another Communist who found a high niche in the State Department. Marzani was indicted in 1947 for perjury in saying that he was not a member of the Communist Party. He was found guilty on all counts in the indictment. Emanuel S. Larsen, another State Department official, paid a fine of \$500 in the infamous Amerasia case, which had to do with the stealing of secret Government documents and turning them over to the Soviets. Judith Coplon, another in our Government service, was found to be spying for Russia. In her trials in both Washington and New York, she was found guilty. Noel Field, another Government official, disappeared behind the iron curtain while under investigation.

Nathan Gregory Silvermaster, still another United States Government official, refused to answer the question as to whether he was a Communist, "for fear of self-incrimination."

In 1942 the Civil Service Commission reported:

There is considerable testimony in the file indicating that, about 1920, Mr. Silvermaster was an underground agent of the Communist Party. From that time until the present . . . he has been everything from a fellow-traveller to an agent of the OGPU (Soviet Political Police).

Yet Silvermaster, protected in some high quarters, went from one confidential Government appointment to another.

Henry Wallace, Vice President of the United States, was prevented by Gen. Leslie Groves, then director of the atomic-bomb project, from seeing secret data about the bomb. When pressed for his reason for not showing Mr. Wallace the secret information, General Groves answered:

We took a number of deliberate risks on security matters in an effort to bring the war

to a quicker end, but we took no unnecessary, recognizable risks.

That is a very significant statement, Mr. President, in connection with withholding information from the Vice President of the United States.

Someone in our Government was responsible for giving access to atomic bomb secrets to Dr. Klaus Fuchs, who passed them on to Soviet espionage agents through Dr. Harry Gold, of Philadelphia, who has since confessed.

#### COMMUNIST INFLUENCE IN FAR EAST POLICY

Without question, there were strong pro-Communist influences at work in shaping American policy in the Far East. As has been well established, this policy came from the so-called Institute of Pacific Relations, and from their publications Pacific Affairs and Far Eastern Survey. A study of the editorial policy of these publications will clearly reveal a pro-Soviet, pro-Chinese Communist bias.

Mr. President, as further evidence of the power of the pro-Communist group in our Government, the famous Amerasia case was suddenly and mysteriously dropped, even after the FBI, which is seldom wrong, had discovered large numbers of confidential documents from the State, War, and Navy Departments and from other Government agencies in the office of Amerasia. One of those arrested by the FBI in the Amerasia case was John S. Service, the same John S. Service who was sent back to America from China by Ambassador Patrick J. Hurley, because, in the opinion of General Hurley, Service was working in the interests of the Soviet Union rather than in the interests of the United States. I understand Service is still in the State Department, and, I am informed, has been promoted.

Much of this has been exposed, but I want to show the pattern. We cannot save ourselves unless we face the truth.

At this critical time, when the pressure is upon us to decide our course to save our sons from untimely death in war, when we are faced starkly with Russian victory over all Asia, we must have the whole truth, whatever it may be.

The pro-Russian clique took over the State Department in 1944. Under oath, before the Un-American Activities Committee on August 30, 1948, Mr. Adolf Berle, former Assistant Secretary of State, testified:

In the fall of 1944 there was a difference of opinion in the State Department. . . . I was pressing for a pretty clean-cut showdown (with the Russians) then (at a time) when our position was strongest. The opposite group in the State Department was largely the men—Mr. Acheson's group, of course, with Mr. Hiss as his principal assistant. . . . I got trimmed in that fight and, as a result, went to Brazil and that ended my diplomatic career.

Later in his testimony, he referred to the Acheson group as the pro-Russian clique.

#### PRO-COMMUNIST INFLUENCE IN THE WAR DEPARTMENT

Still further evidence of the pro-Soviet influence in the administration may be found in the shocking, secret

directive issued December 30, 1944, to let down the bars in the United States Army so that Communists could be commissioned as Army officers. The administration tried to keep this a secret, and even refused to answer congressional inquiries about it until it leaked out.

This order followed one, issued May 7, 1944, to destroy the subversive records within the War Department. In testimony before a congressional committee, the Deputy Chief of Staff said that the directive had been issued without the knowledge of either Secretary of War Stimson or Chief of Staff Marshall, intimating that it had come from someone in the White House.

#### PRO-COMMUNIST INFLUENCE REACHED INTO THE NAVY

Two admirals in our Navy were forced to retire because they tried to get rid of Communist radio operators in United States naval vessels. They were Rear Adm. S. C. Hooper and Rear Adm. Adolphus Staton. Three leaders of the American Communications Association, communistic labor union, 7 of whose 10 national officers were known Communist Party members, called on these admirals and demanded the reinstatement of the suspected subversives whom the admirals had discharged, and the 3 Communist labor leaders quite boldly threatened that unless they were reinstated there would be two admirals out of a job.

The admirals did not give in. There was a conference at the White House, with Secretary Knox and Federal Communications Commissioner Fly present. The admirals were shortly out of a job. Admiral Hooper was given the relatively minor post of inspector in a factory, replacing a \$4,000-a-year civilian. Admiral Staton was retired.

A thorough account of all of this may be found in the New York World Telegram of January 12, 1944, and in the record of hearings before Select Committee, House of Representatives, to Investigate the FCC, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, volumes I and II, particularly pages 1 to 20, page 69 of volume I, and pages 2303 to end of volume II.

#### ADMINISTRATION PROTECTED PRO-COMMUNISTS

Further evidence of the pro-Communist influence within the administration is shown by what happened in regard to the Soviet spy ring which was discovered in Canada. Prime Minister Mackenzie King flew to Washington and presented the President a report on the spy ring. The report contained a list of spies or suspected spies in the United States. So far as is known, not one of that list has been arrested.

Here is another indication of pro-Soviet influence in the administration: Invariably the administration has rushed to the defense of anyone accused of pro-Soviet activities, has refused access to files, and has had a hand in trying to clear the accused pro-Communist, and smear the accuser. Exposés, backed by sworn confessions and a great volume of corroborative evidence, have been called "red herrings," and high Government officials have disgraced themselves by

testifying to the good character of the accused.

Beginning in 1944, when Alger Hiss was put in charge of United States activities in the UN, there has continuously been a strange assortment of persons soft to communism acting as representatives of the United States and as staff members. Small wonder that the UN, created ostensibly to enforce the peace, has been helpless in eastern Europe and in China, and could act in Korea only because of the then temporary absence of Russia and our willingness to carry the burden.

This is not a witch-hunt. It is a review of accepted facts to show, to those who are not afraid to face facts, that there is a pattern suggesting a gigantic conspiracy on behalf of Soviet Russia.

Some so-called American in official position turned over to Russia the hundreds of Danube barges we held, just before the Danubian Conference met. This was our only trading point in that conference. Without it, at the conference, we were treated contemptuously, as could be expected. Was it not one of the pro-Soviets in a Government department who was responsible for our turning these barges over to Russia?

#### THE BERLIN AIRLIFT—STATE DEPARTMENT CRIME

State Department pro-Sovietism caused the Berlin airlift. At Potsdam, in July 1945, it was agreed that our forces in Berlin would have a ground and air corridor from West Germany to Berlin. The State Department opposed getting this in writing from the Russians. The Air Force insisted and got the air corridor written in the agreement. The State Department, somehow or other, is always found to be the Soviet's advocate.

Late in 1948 the UN met in Paris to attempt to settle the Berlin airlift and blockade. It is reported that Ambassador Jessup asked the Chinese delegation, which had intended to vote with the United States, not to do so. This top mystery leaves unanswered the question of whom Ambassador Jessup really represented. Again in Paris, in 1949, at the meeting arranged by Jessup and Malik, which finally ended the airlift, Jessup fought for acceptance of the Russian terms. General Clay had to fight to stop it.

#### ACHESON'S \$90,000,000 LOAN TO POLISH COMMUNISTS

After the Polish Communist Government had scornfully rejected America's request for free elections, as pledged at Yalta, and refused our ambassador permission to visit Americans in jail there, Secretary Acheson approved a \$90,000,000 loan to Poland. Incidentally, Mr. Acheson's law firm acted as the agent of the Polish Communist Government.

#### NATIONALIST CHINA AND GERMAN ARMS

After VE-day, the Chinese applied for surrendered German arms and ammunition. The Joint Chiefs of staff approved, sent orders to General Eisenhower, and 20,000 rifles actually left a German port for China, by way of India. The order was then countermanded by Presidential order signed by Lauchlin Currie, Administrative Assistant, since



named by Whitaker Chambers and Elizabeth Bentley as a pro-Communist. The vast stores of German armament were then destroyed.

#### THE DOUBLE-CROSS IN GERMANY

In discussing pro-Soviet influence we cannot overlook the halt of the American Army's march on Berlin. Who stopped the American Army's march on Berlin? At that time our Ninth Army was not more than 30 miles away. Resistance had practically ceased. They could have been in Berlin the next day. Goebbels' sound trucks were notifying the Berliners to surrender to the Americans.

Who ordered our forces to retreat to the Elbe and leave Berlin for the Russians—a decision that has cost us so dearly since?

Who was responsible for stopping General Patton 30 miles from Prague? In the Saturday Evening Post of April 17, 1948, Demaree Bess reported that Gen. George Patton was ordered to halt his conquest of Czechoslovakia and to refuse the German surrender which had already been made by the German general to one of Patton's colonels. The fate of Czechoslovakia was sealed.

Who ordered General Eisenhower, after the German surrender, to withdraw from already occupied western Saxony and Thuringia and turn them, with their uranium deposits, over to the Russians?

The actions of our Government since 1945 have tended to make more sure that the United States would lose everything she won by the war, and that Soviet Russia would receive all possible benefits.

#### PREMATURE DISBANDING OF AMERICAN ARMY

The United States let Soviet Russia seize just about all the parts of Germany she wanted. The United States proceeded at breakneck speed to disband the American Army and Air Force and to put our fleet in mothballs. The United States proceeded to destroy, in the face of determined opposition of scattered individuals who knew the significance of the move, huge quantities of war material. Bombers that would have been of incalculable value today were ruthlessly destroyed. Even the tools, jigs, and dies for making them were likewise sacrificed. Precision instruments, including watches, were put under trip hammers and destroyed.

Were these steps part of a definite plan of the internationalists—those American citizens who have forgotten, if they ever knew, about the significance of the American Republic, its great history, and its great place in the evolution of human freedom?

#### AID TO RUSSIA

The Communists are now almost certainly using against us in Korea part of the enormous stock of aviation gasoline which we made available to Russia after the World War II crisis had passed.

Back of this situation is the fantastic story of how America helped Stalin in an orgy of stockpiling in the postwar period.

Evidence of traitorous intent and purpose on the part of the pro-Communist group here may be observed in the fact

that when it was exposed that Britain and other Marshall plan countries were sending Russia war-making materials, not one of this influential clique lifted a finger to stop our money and materials from flowing to those countries; in fact, they actually opposed the measure introduced here, which would have stopped our indirect arming of Russia. War-making materials were still being sent to Russia a few weeks ago.

#### ACHESON-LILIENTHAL—BOMB SECRETS TO RUSSIA

Late in 1949, the President proposed to share the atomic bomb with Russia. When the voice of the people against this was heard, then others in the Government service saw to it that the Russians received the atomic bomb secrets anyhow. Without question, the pro-Communists in Government positions were responsible for this traitorous sell-out.

Going back to the origin of the suggestion of giving the atomic bomb secret to Russia, there was the Acheson-Lilienthal report in 1946. It proposed the step-by-step release of all atomic data on the basis of an international agreement. At that time Russia had a 100 percent record of broken promises to us and to all the world.

#### YALTA AND POTSDAM—PRO-COMMUNIST GROUP

It was the pro-Communist group in the Government which formulated the Yalta agreement and the Morgenthau plan and the Potsdam agreement, all of which were not only complete repudiations of the Atlantic Charter, but against all humanitarian principles.

Are there not still further signs of Soviet conspiracy in this country?

The conference at Yalta in February 1945 reported the high point of Soviet diplomatic success and, correspondingly, the low point of American appeasement.

At the price of a few worthless promises Stalin got what he wanted in Poland. We gave the go ahead signal to the Red army to loot East Germany. The Red army proceeded to remove, physically, Germany's industries. Germany was stripped of assets worth many billions of dollars.

In the pro-Soviet climate at Yalta, China was offered up as a sacrifice on the altar of appeasement. The concessions made concerning Manchuria were of fateful importance for China's independence and territorial integrity. To give a strong foreign power like Russia control of Manchurian railways, a predominant interest in its chief port, Dairen, and a naval base at Port Arthur was to sell away China's sovereignty in Manchuria.

In addition to turning over Manchurian railways and its chief port and naval base to the Soviet Union, we also handed her the Kurile Islands. We also told Russia that she could keep Outer Mongolia, which she had stolen.

As is well known, the concession of Manchuria was the important link in the Communist advance into China. Not only did Manchuria have a wealth of coal, iron, soy beans, and other resources, but it was where large investments of Japanese capital and skill had made it the most industrially developed part of

China. Manchuria became the base from which the Chinese Communists could launch the campaign which led them to overrunning almost all of China.

There was not one positive, worthwhile contribution to European or Asiatic stability in the sordid deals at Yalta.

There was no military necessity for the Yalta concessions. America was at that time close to the peak of its military power. We possessed the most powerful navy in the world, the greatest aircraft production in quality and quantity, and an army which had swept the Germans from north Africa, France, Belgium, and much of Italy. Two days before the President left Washington for Yalta he received an official report outlining five Japanese peace overtures which amounted to unconditional surrender. There was no reason to give in to Stalin's far eastern demands. Apparently the President was the victim of the pro-Soviet influence of his American advisors, one of which was the notorious Alger Hiss.

#### GENERAL MARSHALL AND HIS CHINESE AGRARIAN REFORMERS

Was it not pro-Soviet influence in the administration which caused General Marshall to go to China in December 1945 to force the Chinese to accept the Communists in a coalition government? The Communists felt then that they needed this help from a high level official in our Government. At that time the Chinese Republic was at the height of its power. Its Nationalist troops had surrounded 100,000 Communists near Canton and 70,000 near Hankow and had blocked off the rest from Manchuria.

Into this picture, direct from the pro-Communist atmosphere of the American State Department, stepped Gen. George Marshall. General Marshall pressured the Nationalists to withdraw their forces, which permitted the Communists to go into Manchuria, where they obtained the 5-year stock of Japanese arms and ammunition. The Nationalists even agreed to admit 13 Communists into a national council of 40 but the Communists demanded 14 which would have given them veto power since a two-thirds vote was required for changes of policy. To force acceptance of this outrageous demand, General Marshall placed a 10-month embargo against all shipments of arms and ammunition to the Nationalists.

After Congress appropriated \$125,000,000 for military equipment for the Republic of China in April 1948, the administration placed China on so low a priority that no shipments moved until October and then at prices approximately double their cost and fifteen or more times the prices charged Greece and Turkey.

#### PRO-COMMUNIST INFLUENCE IN COMMERCE DEPARTMENT

Here is further evidence of pro-Soviet influence in the administration:

We had the case of a man who called himself Michael Lee. He was a Russian, born in China, and his real name was Ephraim Zinovi Liberman. He had been refused American citizenship on the grounds that he was not in sympathy with the principles of the American Government, and for the further reason that

he was not of good character. Later, however, after changing his name, he succeeded in getting his citizenship papers. And a few weeks later we find him in Washington, D. C., head of a United States Government office having to do with shipments to Asia. Officials of the Republic of China blame him to a great extent for the success of the Reds in China, because he held up shipments of much needed gasoline at a time when the Nationalist Army of China needed it the most.

After persistent effort on the part of the junior Senator from Nevada, we finally got Liberman out of that key position, but not without argument from his superiors in the Department of Commerce.

The postscript to this is almost unbelievable, Mr. President. The Secretary of Commerce, before dismissing Liberman, reversed the loyalty board and cleared Liberman, which action in itself would permit Liberman (or Michael Lee) to get another important Government post in some other United States Government department or agency.

The one who has fought communism in the Far East is Chiang Kai-shek, with his aides and generals. It is interesting in this connection to observe that Chiang Kai-shek is not liked by any pro-Soviet, pro-Communist, or "pink" in Washington, D. C. Chiang Kai-shek represents the free government of China, recognized by America.

If we now betray Chiang into the hands of the Communists, as all the pro-Communists want, free people everywhere will be asking themselves: "Who among us are next to be betrayed by the appeasers in Washington under the cloak of the United Nations?"

It is almost impossible to explain why we do not take advantage of Chiang Kai-shek's offer of troops as foot soldiers in Korea. The present policy makes no sense.

The State Department "generals" continue to reject Chiang's services, although his participation would force Soviet China to withdraw troops from Korea.

There is further evidence, if any should be needed, that communism has friends in our Government in the fact that Chinese Communists were represented to us by State Department white papers as simple agrarian reformers, innocent peasants. Mr. Acheson and his coterie of "pink" intellectuals spent years in building State Department policy and American public opinion to support the theory that these Chinese Communists were the leaders of China whom we should support.

#### THE KOREAN WAR

It was this same State Department group that insisted that the United Nations forces be held up at the thirty-eighth parallel for more than a week, until the United Nations could at its leisure grant them official authority to go beyond that point, a fact that gave the North Koreans an opportunity to regroup their forces and provide costly resistance.

And it is this group who dictate, at this minute, that the American forces must not fight the war as it should be fought, with the bombing of strategic targets behind the enemy lines, to paralyze their supplies and their reserves.

The American army was turned over to the United Nations by the Administration after they were sent into Korea. The UN immediately placed them under a committee some of whose members represent countries which have recognized Communist China. Thus we have the spectacle of a United States Army fighting Communist China while being under the control of those who are friendly to and have recognized Communist China.

#### THE UNITED NATIONS—COMMUNIST INFLUENCE

Incidentally, if the United Nations is ever to be useful to the human race, it must free itself of Communist domination.

Who may I ask, is responsible for our begging the Chinese Communists through the United Nations to let up on their war against us, while at the same time virtually telling them that we will not let our military men bomb their sources of supply?

#### THE UNITED STATES SENATE AND MILITARY DECISIONS

We have heard here on the Senate floor insistence from certain quarters that Members of this body should not try to decide military maneuvers. I certainly agree with this. There is, however, sometimes a thin line between the realm of military decision and the realm of foreign policy. It is not only the right but the duty of this body to examine matters pertaining to the foreign policy of the United States.

Incidentally, I have no doubt but that some of these same people who do not want us to discuss military policies here would justify the actions of other non-military men in making military decisions.

Did the unconditional surrender demand in World War II come from military men? Was it our military men who decided to withdraw from Saxony and Thuringia and turn them over to the Russians? Was it our military men who decided to let the Russians enter Berlin first?

Was it our military men who recommended that we share our atomic bomb secrets with Russia?

Was it our military men who held General MacArthur at the thirty-eighth parallel while the Chinese Communists were completing their preparations to enter the fight?

Are the military decisions being made by the United Nations "generals" quite satisfactory with those here who ask us to be quiet about such matters?

Do we leave military decisions to military men only when the military men agree wholeheartedly with the State Department "generals"?

#### THE PRESIDENT AND THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The President said, in his budget message: "When the American people resolved to undertake the defense program now under way, they accepted also the

necessity for the increases in their taxes that the level of expenditures requires."

When, I ask, Mr. President, did the American people resolve to undertake the defense program now under way? How did they make their resolution known? When did they resolve to accept the incident tax burdens?

If the administration thinks it is reflecting the wishes of the American people, I challenge the administration to submit the matter to a popular vote of all the people.

#### WHAT HAPPENED TO \$50,000,000,000?

Since the close of World War II, Congress has appropriated more than fifty thousand million dollars for defense. Where is this equipment and preparation which we have paid for? Is there any reason to believe that more billions would not be wasted in the same way?

The President reaches for more power and more billions with hands too weak to use it effectively.

When Mr. Truman became President, he became Commander in Chief of the greatest Air Force, the greatest Navy, and the most powerful Army in the history of the world. According to the Hoover Commission report, we had equipment for 89 divisions at the end of the war.

When Mr. Truman became President, those of our allies who ruled by consent of their people numbered their population at 1,700,000,000. Furthermore, since Mr. Truman became President, Congress has given him the defense appropriations for which he has asked. What can he show us today? An Army which he has allowed to disintegrate, which can now be pushed around by a fifth-rate power; a Navy, much of which has been scuttled; an Air Force which is mostly on paper. And today, 830,000.00 people are ruled from the Kremlin; while our allies, if any, are on unknown quantity.

#### WORLD CONTRIBUTIONS—FRIENDSHIP PURCHASE

For nearly 5½ years the United States has poured into foreign countries \$36,500,000,000 plus \$6,052,000,000 in military aid. It was to buy for us and the world, peace, and for us friendship, the kind of friends who will take off their coats when we get into a fight.

The peace is fictional, as Korea has shown. As to the friendship these billions are supposed to have bought, that too, is proving illusory. After 5 years of vast tribute to ally and defeated enemy alike, we find ourselves fighting virtually alone.

But regardless of all things, with the President and his coterie of advisers, unfortunately, the policy seems to be spend as usual, give away as usual, bureaucracy as usual.

#### RECOGNITION OF COMMUNIST CHINA

Pursuing a bit further the subject of official recognition of the Chinese Reds, which is the great goal of the Soviets, here and abroad:

There are evidences that State Department officials have been advancing this cause of the Communists on a global scale. The Italian Foreign Minister, Count Carlo Sforza, told the Chamber of Deputies that the Italian Government



had been considering recognition of the Communist regime in China, and he indicated that the Italian attitude on that question had been influenced strongly by some alluring suggestions which he said had been made to him by persons in "very responsible quarters" during his trip to the United States last September.

These suggestions, he said, were that the Soviet Union would not veto Italy's admission to the United Nations if the United States and other member states would not veto the admission of Communist China.

The United States is playing diametrically opposing roles, Mr. President.

In the one case, we are resisting Moscow's aggression with arms. In the other case, we, first, compel China to go into an alliance with the Soviet Union; second, we attempt to force upon the Chinese Government a peaceful submission to Moscow's control, through a coalition with the Soviet puppets, the Chinese Communists; and, finally, we covertly seek the recognition of the Kremlin's conquest by announcing long in advance our intended refusal to defend the Chinese Republic by use of a United States veto in its behalf. It will be remembered that last year, when Mr. Acheson returned from Europe, after a conference he announced to Members of both Houses of Congress at a meeting that the United States would not use the veto in the United Nations to prevent the admission of Communist China.

Such a conclusion is inescapable when observing the course of the State Department's dealings since 1944.

Current belief anticipates the final consummation of this sell-out of the Nationalist Government within a few weeks. We are not talking about years, Mr. President; it will come within a few weeks.

#### ENGLAND AND COMMUNIST CHINA

While Mr. Truman was mouthing his no-appeasement pledge to Congress, Attlee and the other prime ministers of the British Commonwealth were deciding in London that the Communist regime in China should receive sympathetic consideration; that it should not only be seated in the United Nations but that it should be handed Formosa; and that it should have an equal voice with the United States in any peace treaty dictated to Japan, which we defeated single-handedly.

It was against this background that the British bloc in UN, supported by countries of Asia and the Middle East, worked out the UN terms for a far eastern Munich, granting the Chinese Communists everything it ever asked as the price for ending the Korean war.

#### THE UNITED NATIONS SELL-OUT

Further evidence of what the UN proposed to do about admission of the Communist regime in China may be found in the report of the so-called cease-fire committee of the UN. It specified that England, the United States, Soviet Russia, and the Chinese Communist regime should participate in a conference to decide the question of Formosa and the question of China's

representation in the UN. The suggested conference would not include representatives of the Chinese Nationalist Government, but would include representatives of the Communist regime in China, who would sit down with the representatives of the United Nations to decide the fate of China. Is not this exclusion in itself a judgment and a decision?

With such a conference, there would be only two questions to resolve:

First. How would the Communist Reds like Formosa—rare, medium, or well done?

Second. How soon could the Chinese Reds send delegates to unseat the regular delegates of the Republic of China?

If the shabby deal, to which our representatives agreed, had gone through, these would have been the results—as quoted from the January 13 issue of the Chicago Tribune:

1. The aggressor would be richly rewarded, in contradiction of the cries of "no appeasement."

2. The United States would have fought a costly and useless war at Truman's instigation in Korea and had its ears beaten off for the privilege of giving to the Chinese Communists not only Korea but Formosa and other advantages not remotely at issue in Korea.

3. The very willingness of the State Department to entertain such a deal shows that Korea itself was never worth a fight, but that more than 6,200 Americans have been slaughtered in Korea in order to gratify Communist China's demand for Formosa, a base from which the whole American position in the Pacific can be threatened.

Mr. President, we should add the total of approximately 46,000 American boys who are wounded, missing, or killed.

I quote further from the article appearing in the Chicago Tribune:

4. The British have succeeded in putting across the great appeasement gift package in order to curry favor with Communist China so that they may hope to retain Hong Kong. Nobody is suggesting the surrender of Hong Kong in place of Formosa.

5. Chiang Kai-shek's large Nationalist Army on Formosa will be sacrificed to the Communists, ending all opposition to the Peking regime of Mao; and Chiang will, in all likelihood, go the way of General Mihailovitch and other sacrifices to the Communist executioner.

6. America will be left without a friend in Asia or the Pacific. Anti-Communists not yet sacrificed will hasten to come to terms with the triumphant Communist tide.

7. Secretary of State Acheson will achieve his most faithful service to his British masters, together with his greatest contribution to Communist success.

Mr. President, parents whose captured sons had their hands tied and were shot in the face, want no such appeasement of Communists anywhere.

What can we do?

#### REMEMBER WASHINGTON'S ORDER

No civilization is destroyed from the outside unless it has already decayed from within. A wise philosopher once said: "No empire is conquered from abroad unless it has first destroyed itself."

Few fields need more to be reexamined than the presence and practices in high or strategic places of alien minds who

have helped formulate American policy. Some have been smoked out.

But we should remember George Washington's order at a critical point in the American Revolution, "Put none but Americans on guard tonight!"

#### PUT AMERICANS ON GUARD

No person against whom there are citations for communistic association, by either the Attorney General's office or the House Committee on Un-American Activities, should be even considered for any office. Mr. President, we have reached a deplorable state of affairs when we find that it is necessary to appoint to high positions in the United States Government persons who have been on trial for treason against this country.

At the height of this folly, it virtually became necessary, as a condition of being considered for a high appointive office in the Government, for the applicant to have been investigated for traitorous conduct.

Many American people are now awake and alert to the danger. Still there is reason to fear that if the same men are continued in power, whether in public office or even in an advisory capacity behind the administration, the United States will continue to decline and Soviet Russia will triumph.

#### THIS INCREDIBLE TREND

To those who have given no careful thought to what we are up against, all this will seem incredible. Yet unless we realize that it can happen and do the necessary things to prevent it, there is great danger that it will happen.

The most important step toward preventing world war III is to destroy the Soviet fifth column in the United States. This is not going to be done by ignoring it.

There must be a complete clean-up. These men who still sit in control and push the buttons are responsible for the tragedy of Korea. Any statement by a defender of this group or its head does not change that fact. What is going on did not just happen. It was brought on by persons who did wrong things and followed the wrong policies.

No individual or bloc should be permitted at this time to deteriorate America's capacity to survive.

Let us clean house. Let us have only Americans on guard.

#### HOW LONG?

How long is the public going to submit to the foibles of those in the Administration who have followed the party line of the Kremlin, who have been loyal to our enemy at the expense of our own country?

Unfortunately, public opinion in the past placed no effective brake on the mistaken Administration policies in which Soviet agents and propagandists, native and foreign, found it easy to operate. Now, however, the American public is making itself heard and through this it may be possible to head off this sell-out to the Communists.

#### COMMUNIST CHINA MUST NOT BE RECOGNIZED

Our one salvation may be found in the voice of the people, sounding forth in

wires and letters to the President, to Senators and Congressmen, and to editors and columnists and commentators.

Every loyal American should make his voice heard against admission to the UN and recognition by the United States of the Chinese Communists. Every loyal American should demand that every possible means, including our veto power in the United Nations, be used to defeat this long-range goal of the Soviets.

#### ACHESON AND THE VETO POWER

Dean Acheson said that we would not use the veto in the United Nations to prevent that admission, but the voice of the American people is more powerful than that of Mr. Acheson. If the people of America do not want this deplorable sell-out to Russia, which will affect seriously the future of the world, let them now speak in clear and unmistakable terms. And let this body always represent the will of the people.

#### THERE IS YET TIME—THE CONSTITUTION

There is yet time, God willing, for the American people to regain the control over their own destinies, so wisely guaranteed by the Constitution. There is yet time to snatch from usurpation by ignorant little men and their traitorous advisers the basic powers categorically affirmed by the Constitution of the United States.

It is only the Constitution, and the people's stringent demand that it be observed, that will preserve government "of" and "by" the people and deliver us from the consequences of the folly that has long guided our affairs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the 10 recommendations made by the junior Senator from Nevada in his December 14 address.

There being no objection, the recommendations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### TEN SUGGESTIONS IN PRESENT EMERGENCY

1. Forthwith stop assistance of every nature to Communist nations and to nations in any way assisting Russia or her satellites to consolidate Soviet gains and to prepare for World War III.

2. Stop supporting colonial slavery in any form anywhere.

3. Oppose the recognition of Communist China by the United Nations with every means at our command.

4. Three suggested approaches to the war in Korea and Asia:

A. We could do the obvious thing—arm Chiang Kai-shek's nationals and guerrillas to furnish the foot soldiers for the job, then under General MacArthur make the most efficient use of our air power, our Navy, including submarines, to destroy the war-making power of Communist Korea and the aggressor Communist China troops.

B. We could withdraw from Korea, arm and equip Chiang Kai-shek's troops, and let him do the job. It would require a longer time, but he would engage the Communist forces to the extent that it would be doubtful if they could harass us for a considerable time.

C. We could completely abandon Korea and China with all of its possible consequences and repercussions.

D. We can then establish our first line of defense through Japan, Formosa, Okinawa, Guam, the Philippines, Indonesia, New Guinea, and Australia.

E. If all of these suggestions are discarded, then we can come home and defend the

Western Hemisphere. We must be prepared to defend this continent in any case. The one thing that we cannot do is to continue the present course of indecision and nervous jittery attitude.

5. Inform the governments of Europe which still maintain political and economic agreements with the Soviet Union that these should be terminated at the earliest possible date, as a prerequisite to the continued friendship and assistance of Europe in the United States.

6. Give no more money as loans or gifts to any government, but if necessary loan such funds to private business in strategic areas without weakening our own economy, in the same manner that the RFC loans such funds to private business in this country in times of stress.

7. Build as rapidly as possible a military force, spearheaded by an adequate submarine fleet and an air corps of whatever number of groups may be called for, and install radar equipment to protect the Western Hemisphere.

8. If the European people will enlist in their own armies and furnish the ground troops, then serve notice on Russia that any move on Europe will be met with an aggressive aerial attack on their means of making war, using every means at our command to defeat their purpose of controlling Europe.

9. In every possible way, protect and strengthen our national economy; while making all possible speed toward proper preparedness, guard well our national economy; stop wasting the hard-earned dollars of our taxpayers through Marshall plan and other give-away schemes; inaugurate a businesslike fiscal policy.

10. Clean up our own government, throw out the Communists, Communist associates, adherents to foreign ideologies, persons of abnormal moral weakness and other dangerous security risks. The Armed Services Committees of the Congress should immediately institute a thorough investigation to determine why we are not prepared to fight a war.

#### THE STRUGGLE AGAINST COMMUNISM

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, our Nation is girding for a desperate struggle with Communist aggression. The nature of that struggle may be measured by our preparations, which are going so far as to completely disrupt and recast our economy. In a short time we shall experience economic regimentation such as we have known previously only during all-out war. We are going to be asked for new taxes, which will have the effect of diverting to the Federal Government 26 cents out of every dollar that is earned in this country, reducing our standard of living in just that proportion. We also have in prospect a military force of approximately 3,500,000 men and women, which may involve the drafting of 18-year-olds. That, or universal military training, which is another prospect would have a further profound effect on our social structure.

What is it we are preparing for? What are we preparing against?

The world now knows that communism operates on three fronts in its program of aggression for world dominion.

It operates, first, within its target countries, by penetration and infiltration. It does so by novel and consequently most dangerous means. It operates through native tongues and native minds. All those who do the bidding of the Kremlin do not carry the cards of the Communist Party, which they actually serve. The test is not so much

whether they actually carry cards in the Communist Party and thereby aid the Communist movement, but the test is, Do their deeds serve communism and communistic aggression?

Second, it operates through its satellites or puppets, employing their armed forces for purposes of aggression. This is the story of the North Koreans and the Chinese Reds. No one knows this better than the American boys now serving in Korea against these evil forces. Only 2 days ago, the Senate adopted a resolution asserting it to be the sense of the Senate that the United Nations should immediately declare Communist China to be an aggressor in Korea. Everyone who had ears and who wanted to hear knew that Communist China was an aggressor. Certainly the boys at the front did not require a statement by the Senate of the United States to know that Communist and Socialist and Red China was an aggressor. This is imperialist Communist aggression, even though no Russian soldier may be engaged in the conflict. The movement emanates from Russia as the second front of its imperialist designs.

Third, Communism stands ready with the tremendous Russian military machine to enforce its objectives where either of its other two tactics fail or are insufficient.

We are now preparing to defend against the naked aggression of the second and third tactics. We are planning to spend something like \$70,000,000,000 a year to build up a resistance force against the armed aggression of Russia and its satellites.

But what of the first front—internal penetration?

This is the front on which the ultimate battles will be fought and where ultimate solutions lie.

Mr. President, even though a nation be defeated by the military might of communism, it will finally end up by facing internal penetration and the destruction of the rights and the liberties of its citizens. As such it can have no less than equal importance with the military front, for it can sabotage the military effort.

This is the front upon which Russia, since 1945, has increased its dominion from 15 percent of the world's land area to 30 percent, and from less than 10 percent of the world's population to approximately 33 percent. This was the method used in taking over China, with the exception of those persons who are now acting as guerrillas in China, and those who are on Formosa. It did not take a Russian gun to make China a puppet of the Communist world.

I scarcely need to recall the tortuous struggle which has gone on within this country to establish protections against this device of internal penetration by communism. Members of Congress all recall the rocky road of the House Un-American Activities Committee. I recall vividly the attempts of an investigating subcommittee of which I was chairman in 1948 to pierce the iron curtain at home and inquire into the operations of the Government's loyalty program. We ran head on, as have so many other committees of Congress, into a



refusal by the executive departments to open their doors for inspection.

Essentially, the struggle to protect against the internal penetration of communism in this country has revolved about a contest between the executive branch and the Congress. For many years strong sentiment in Congress has sought to erect barriers to the penetration of Communist influences in America by their exposure and by efforts at corrective legislation.

Equally strong sentiment in the executive branch has sought to minimize the threat by dismissing it as nonexistent and by defying congressional efforts to prevent it. The executive branch has taken the position that any problem which exists in this field can be solved by executive decree. Hence the listing of subversive organizations by the Attorney General. Hence the Government loyalty boards, which are responsible only to the Executive and which in fact are limited so that they may not pass upon the fundamental question of security, as against the abstruse question of loyalty.

Mr. President, under Executive order today, if a person who had been a Communist in the 1940's or the 1930's and carried a Communist card at that time comes before a loyalty board and denies that he was such a Communist, thereby committing perjury, he cannot be taken from the public payroll unless perchance the perjury can be proved on the spot. Knowing how difficult it is to prove perjury, this is a strange standard. As I have previously stated, it is not a question of whether or not he carries a Communist card. The question is whether he is serving communism. Is he serving communism rather than the fundamental principles of the Republic for which he is now working? That is a test of security and the meaning of loyalty.

From this independent attitude of the executive branch which I have described comes also the untiring defiance of Congress by the President, when the Congress has sought information on possible subversion from executive files.

But this problem of internal defense cannot be solved unilaterally, by the President or by mere decrees.

We are a nation owing allegiance to laws, and not to men. This is a problem which must be solved by laws. Laws are the function of Congress. But to have proper and effective laws with which to protect our liberties and our freedoms we must have the facts. They must be facts developed by the Congress to its own satisfaction, in order to discharge its functions and responsibilities.

The President has consistently opposed that point of view by a determination to substitute his facts and his decrees.

There now comes a new and highly significant development in the struggle to protect this Nation on the first front of Communist aggression which is through internal penetration.

The President has just appointed another commission to deal with problems of loyalty and internal security.

This latest move is extremely unfortunate because it plainly appears to be

another maneuver by the President which is bound to create strained relations between the Executive and Congress. The whole history of loyalty and security in Government service has been one long series of attempts by the President to thwart the Congress in its attempt to protect the country from subversive influences.

There is at this moment pending in Congress Senate Resolution 27, Eighty-second Congress, introduced by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to set up a Senate bipartisan commission to investigate loyalty and security cases. There has also been set up in the Judiciary Committee a bipartisan investigating subcommittee to deal with the subject through Senate Resolution 366, Eighty-first Congress. These actions in Congress have come about after several years of deplorable conditions in the executive branch in the matter of loyalty and security cases.

At this moment the President has still another board, provided for under Public Law 831 of the Eighty-first Congress, the Internal Security Act. That Board is presently compromised in its functioning because the President has not submitted the names of his appointees to the Senate. Can it be that by appointing his own new board, the President intends to ignore the laws and procedures provided by Congress?

When the President, by Executive order, creates a new commission on the same subject, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that once again the President seeks to foreclose congressional action on these vital matters. It is difficult to escape the feeling that the President once again has been persuaded by his advisers to cloak the subject with confusion in the hope that nothing effective will be done about security risks in Government service.

These advisers—whenever they are—have reason to fear Congress. It has only been through the insistent pressure of Congress that people like Marzani, Hiss, Wadleigh, Remington, and others have been brought to light. It will be only through Congress that the State Department and other agencies of Government will be cleared of security risks. People of questionable standing in the executive departments know that, and hence they are determined to keep all loyalty and security investigations in hands they can control.

There are many aspects about the President's latest move that should give Congress occasion for sober thought.

The President's Executive order amounts to the setting up of a commission which to all intents and purposes is above the status of duly constituted committees of Congress.

The President's commission, which is appointed by him, is responsible only to him. It should be made clear that it is not a commission which is elected by the people, or is responsible to the people, as Members of Congress are responsible. If the people of the United States understood that the only purpose of the commission was to advise the President of the United States, it would be one thing. I fear that the commission will be accepted as some-

thing much more than it is, as a substitute for the fact-finding and policy-making functions of Congress. I fear that is intentionally its design.

The President's commission is given powers which the President has denied to Congress.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the able Senator from Michigan whether the Constitution contains any authority for such an appointment by the President.

Mr. FERGUSON. I know of no such authority in the Constitution, for an executive commission to displace the functions of Congress. However, if the President merely wants personal advice on the subject, I believe the Constitution would allow him to seek such personal advice from a commission which he could name, or from people whose advice he sought.

Mr. KEM. Does not the Executive order in the present case contemplate that certain power or authority shall be vested in the commission? In other words, is the commission purely advisory?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; the announcement of the appointment of the commission suggests an attempt to go much further than merely seeking advice from it.

Mr. KEM. Under the Constitution, is it not the duty and responsibility of the legislative branch of the Government to set up such a body?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Massachusetts has introduced a bill under which such a commission would be created for the purpose of doing the job on behalf of the people.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan whether or not the proposed commission represents another instance of the apparent desire on the part of the President to build up the power and authority of the executive branch of the Government at the expense of the legislative branch.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is absolutely correct. It is sad to contemplate that we should be faced continuously with such action on the part of the President. The same question presented itself very forcibly when the President said, in effect, that the Army belonged to the President, and that he could send it wherever he wanted to send it and use it in any way he wanted to use it. Of course, since then he has shown some realization that such a position on his part will not satisfy the people of America.

Mr. KEM. Has not the President done more than merely claim such authority? Has he not actually exercised such authority in issuing the order under which the Armed Forces of the United States went into battle in Korea?

Mr. FERGUSON. The President claimed that he was acting under a statute which authorized him to send troops to Korea in order to carry out orders or executive decrees of the United Nations.

Mr. KEM. Was that subject referred to in the original press release which was read to the Senate by the majority

leader? My recollection is that it was not referred to.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not recall that it was referred to in the original press release.

Mr. KEM. Was that not the first time the Senate knew of the action which the President of the United States had taken?

Mr. FERGUSON. That was the first time that the Senator from Michigan knew about it, and I am sure the Senate had not previously known about it. I know of no conferences that were held with Representatives of Congress and I know of no word that had come to the Senate prior to that time.

Mr. KEM. I shall not tax the Senator much further. I should like to ask him whether he does not regard it as one of the most pressing and important problems, not only before the Congress, but before the American people as well, who love the Constitution, to see that the elected Representatives of the people resume their constitutional functions, as intended by the founding fathers?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Missouri has stated the problem very clearly. The issue is drawn when we look at the Constitution, which separates the powers of the Federal Government among three coordinate branches. That separation of powers was a device to protect a basic conception of the inalienable rights of the people, of rights which may not be taken from them except by their consent and as a gift from them. Under the Constitution we have a government of limited jurisdictions, because sovereignty is in the people. The people reserve to themselves certain inalienable rights. The Constitution and its concept of inalienable rights of the people stands. But somehow or other we are losing the philosophy, the mores which holds that government is the servant of the people. When such powers are taken from the jurisdiction of the legislative branch of the Government, whose representatives in the House are elected from districts, and in the Senate from States as a whole, it is in effect taking rights away from the people of the United States. When that is done we no longer have the Republic as it was conceived and created by the founding fathers.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to ask the Senator several questions having to do with his very able address and presentation of this important subject. I came to the Chamber only a few minutes ago. I assume the Senator is speaking of the new loyalty commission, which is to be headed by Admiral Nimitz.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. First, I should like to say that my attitude with respect to the commission was inadvertently misrepresented in the public press the other day, when at least one article stated that I had praised the appointment. I did not mean to indicate that I approved or praised the creation of the new loyalty commission. I praised Admiral Nimitz as a highly patriotic Amer-

ican citizen, for whom I have great personal admiration.

Mr. FERGUSON. I join the Senator in that statement. I trust my remarks regarding the commission will not be misunderstood as reflecting upon the character or qualifications of Admiral Nimitz.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I did not express approval of the appointment of the commission. I fear it will be compounding evils already in existence. I should like to ask the Senator whether he feels any commission of this kind, arbitrarily set up under the complete and sole control—and secret control—of the President, can possibly operate to clear out the known subversives and fellow travelers in Government so long as the Executive order under which it operates requires the commission to find that an individual is at the moment of hearing a member of the Communist Party, and limits it to that particular finding before the commission can act?

Mr. FERGUSON. I think it is absolutely impossible. It is merely an attempt to lull the people into a sense of security which does not actually exist. The test is not, as I have already said, whether an individual carries a membership card in the Communist Party on the day of the order or the date of the hearing. The test is, Does he owe allegiance to the Communist movement of the world, and is he carrying out such allegiance, instead of being loyal to the Republic of the United States of America?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like more specifically to bring a case to the attention of the Senator and see if his understanding of the general principles involved is virtually the same as mine.

Let us take the Remington case, which is now pending in the courts. It is my understanding that the so-called Loyalty Board which, as a Government agency, cleared Mr. Remington some time ago, cleared him, among other things, on the basis that, while they admitted there was reasonable ground to believe that he had been a Communist at some time in the past, yet his denial that he was now a Communist was an obstacle over which they could not jump, in the light of the President's restrictive order that they must find him to be now a Communist or he could not be discharged from public office. Does the Senator understand that there is a great element of that particular factor in these investigations?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I do. I understand that that is the claim of the Loyalty Board.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is my understanding, too.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Arthur Krock, of the New York Times, has written a column upon the subject, clearly pointing that out to be the position of the Loyalty Board. Until recently the Senator from Michigan could not fathom how the Loyalty Board was able to clear Mr. Remington. The Senator from Michigan does not fully understand as

yet, unless the answer is as given by the Senator from Iowa and Mr. Krock, how it was possible to clear him, when the Board's own files showed evidence that there was reason to believe that he had been a Communist, or owed allegiance to communism. As I have previously indicated I do not draw a distinction between membership and allegiance when it is a question of loyalty.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Leaving the Remington case, as a particular case, out of consideration, and taking a hypothetical case, I believe that the facts which I state are true, and that what I have described as to procedure is true. Therefore, under the President's recent order, which so restricts the Loyalty Board, if it follows his order it can scarcely operate. This is the illustration:

Assume that an individual was proved beyond all doubt, by his own admission, to have been a Communist for the past 7 or 8 years, up until 6 months ago, we will say. He states, at the time of the loyalty examination, "It is true that I had been a Communist for a long period of time, but for the past several months or a year I have not been a member of the Communist Party." The Loyalty Board is unable to produce proof that he is at this moment a member of the Communist Party, although it may have strong reason to believe that he may secretly be a member. Under the President's order, if it were followed strictly, the Board would be required to clear that man, because the Board could not produce positive proof that he was at that particular moment a member of the Communist Party.

I believe that the order has been interpreted as going that far, and that it virtually ties the hands of any loyalty board. The President has established one board on top of another, which compounds confusion in the matter. Any loyalty board established under his recent order could not function unless it could produce proof positive that at the present moment—not yesterday, last week, or last month, but at this moment—the man is an active, operating Communist. The Communists have ordered their members to go underground, to deny their membership, and conceal every activity they can. That makes the order practically unworkable. I wonder if the Senator agrees.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree that is what the Board interprets the order to mean. It is now coming to light for the first time that for all these years the Board has been functioning under an order which it believes should be so interpreted as to require proof of disloyalty, as of the time of the hearings.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I invite the Senator's attention to a report filed by one of the departments. I have not seen it for some months. I will not name the



department. I am sure that the Senator must be familiar with the report.

The examining board went through the department and found and reported, for example, 28 or 30 individuals whom it found to be actually disloyal. The board restored to their former status and pay and returned to work 40 or 50 other individuals whom the board itself stated it strongly suspected. The board strongly doubted their loyalty to the United States, but it was unable to prove an overt act in the past few months. Therefore those employees were restored to their jobs, even though the board strongly suspected them, and was of the opinion, without proof of an overt act, that they were disloyal. Is the Senator familiar with that report?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am not familiar with the particular report, but I am familiar with the fact that there has been that interpretation of the board's function. I am also familiar with the fact that on as many as three occasions when the Loyalty Board itself had every reason to believe that there was evidence of disloyalty, an individual's case was directed to be reviewed by the loyalty board of the particular department, but each time the case was sent back to the over-all Board. There was so much question about the person's loyalty that the case was sent back three times; yet, all that time the person was on the payroll of the Government.

I know it to be a fact that on occasion there would be an order in the personnel file of an individual to the effect that because of the strong suspicion and evidence of disloyalty, the particular employee was not to see any confidential papers. While that person was working for the Government, and while the order was in the file, the man for whom the person was working as secretary did not even know that such an order was in the file, and was allowing the secretary to see all the documents which came across his desk.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I shall not trespass further on the Senator's time.

Does the Senator believe that we will ever get a vigorous job done in cleaning subversives out of the American Government, in the interest of the American public, until the Executive and the department heads of the Government are themselves determined to do an honest and sincere job of cleaning them out?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is the opinion of the Senator from Michigan. Until those who have had working for them persons who have been disloyal, or with respect to whom there is evidence of disloyalty, come to the conclusion that they are willing to confess error, subversives are not going to be cleaned out.

What we need is men occupying these positions who will do what General Lee did. When Pickett made his famous charge at Gettysburg and lost practically his entire army, and came in tears and blood to where General Lee sat upon his horse watching the charge, General Lee said even before Pickett could speak, "It

was my mistake." Such honesty, and a capacity for self-criticism, is what we need in Government. Not maintenance of vested interest in error, but confession of error is what we need.

I welcome the colloquy with the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Iowa. Before departing from my prepared remarks I had observed that the President gives to the new Commission powers which he has denied to Congress. The President has directed all executive departments and agencies of the Federal Government to cooperate with the Commission. When Congress, in the past, sought to get such cooperation, the President either denied it outright or so limited the cooperation that Congress' hands were tied.

Mr. President, an admiral in the United States Navy appeared before a Senate committee on which I was serving, and told the committee that by direct orders of the President he could not testify. It happens we were seeking certain loyalty data which he alone was in a position to provide. How can the Congress solve its problems when its hands are tied in that way?

The President's Commission now being appointed is to have, it is said, access to all classified information and even individual files which the President has denied to Members of Congress.

I should like someone to explain on the Senate floor, in behalf of the President of the United States, how it can be possible that he should refuse that kind of data to a committee of the United States Senate, whose Members are elected by the people of their respective States, while he now says he is willing to give it to nine members of a commission to be appointed by himself, individuals who have not been elected by the people of the United States and therefore hold no direct responsibility to them. How can he now say that he will not only give such data to the Commission, but that he will give it also to their hundreds of employees, whereas he denies to give, even in executive session, that kind of evidence to the Congress of the United States and its duly selected congressional committees, composed of persons who have been elected by and are directly responsible to the people. I should like to have that explained upon the Senate floor. I believe the people of the United States are entitled to such an explanation.

The Commission is to be vested with power to make recommendations for legislation. Does that not suggest an infringement of the powers of congressional committees? It is the basic duty of the committees of the Congress to look into the question of what legislation may be needed and enacted.

In fact, the Commission will have all the powers normally possessed by standing committees of Congress, and in addition it will have powers which the President denies to Congress.

Congress will do well to ponder the significance of this condition. Already the executive department has encroached heavily on the functions and powers of the legislative department. And now we have the President setting

up a committee which is superior to a congressional committee in a field squarely within the province of Congress.

This Commission is directed to do what Congress must do itself. Congress has been trying for 4 years to develop the true facts on which legislation must be based. The President has thus far not only failed to cooperate with Congress, but has affirmatively denied Congress the facts it must have. Congress cannot take the recommendations of this Commission as the facts. It must have and develop the facts for itself.

In his statement the President declares he wants to keep security problems from falling into the arena of "partisanship." But his own action in seeking to foreclose Congress by the appointment of an independent commission is itself a partisan action. The President alone is to designate the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and all other members of his Commission. His appointments will not be subject to the advice or consent of the Senate. That in itself is a partisan action because we know how such commissions have been selected in the past. From past history we know they will assert their independence of Congress. We know they will refuse to cooperate with Congress. We know they will withhold information from Congress. What is this, then, but a partisan device?

What the President did as a unilateral action should have been done in cooperation with Congress. The President's statement on the appointment of this new Commission should have been addressed to Congress, asking for cooperation. Congress is a bipartisan body—the legislature of all the people. Its Members are the representatives of the people—elected by the people and responsible to the people. Loyalty and security is the people's business. The President almost intimates that he does not trust the Congress.

Some uncomfortable conclusions stem from the President's latest act:

First. The creation of yet another commission looks like an attempt to foreclose congressional action on the public business.

Second. The creation of such a commission looks like a further encroachment of the executive on the legislative body because the President's commission parallels congressional committees and is vested with powers superior to congressional committees.

Third. The President's action looks like an attempt at further confusion of loyalty and security matters which are now confusion worse confounded.

Fourth. The President's action comes close to an open disregard for Public Law 831, passed by the Eighty-first Congress expressly to deal with internal security and subversive matters. O, the Senate well knows what the President thinks of that law, for he vetoed it, but notwithstanding his veto it was passed.

Fifth. Even though the President speaks of nonpartisan treatment of loyalty and security matters—and, Mr. President, I say in utmost sincerity that nothing should be further from politics

than the matter of loyalty and security in the United States—his act in setting up this Commission by his sole appointment of its members and by vesting the Commission with powers denied to standing congressional committees, is itself a partisan action.

I fear the only result to come from this is further confusion, further strained relations between the President and Congress, and continuing danger to the country from subversion, disloyalty, and security risks in an hour of great peril for America.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator if a commission set up by Executive order has the power to compel attendance of witnesses and require their testimony?

Mr. FERGUSON. I cannot positively answer the question propounded by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. Would the Senator as a lawyer venture the opinion that is something which is very doubtful?

Mr. FERGUSON. I would consider it very doubtful. The Senator's question is most pertinent. If the Commission is to function at all effectively, even no more than to advise the President, it would have to be in the position of subpoenaing witnesses, and taking their testimony under oath, upon which a charge of perjury might be based. Those powers are clearly possessed by committees of Congress, of course, and that is one reason the committees are very effective.

Mr. KEM. Such an order runs in the name of the United States of America, does it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, it would have to.

Mr. KEM. Could it be issued otherwise than by means of the authority of the Congress of the United States?

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree that it would have to come under some law enacted by the Congress.

Mr. KEM. The Senator does not know of any law by which the Congress has authorized the issuance of such subpoenas, does he?

Mr. FERGUSON. By the new Commission? No, I know of none. That is why I doubt that such subpoena authority exists. On the other hand, I do not see how such an agency can function effectively without that authority.

Mr. President, in the course of my colloquy with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] I cited an article by Mr. Arthur Krock in the New York Times for January 23, and quoted indirectly from it. I now ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### BASIC PROBLEM OF LOYALTY REVIEW BOARD

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 22.—The members of the new and statutory Subversive Activi-

ties Control Board, headed by Seth W. Richardson, still await confirmation by the Senate as they proceed with the early stages of their onerous task. The members of the President's Loyalty Review Board, which is not statutory and therefore is not subject to confirmation, are working under a different kind of handicap. But one difficulty which confronts both groups has its origin in Executive Order No. 9835.

Though Mr. Richardson is a North Dakota Republican of undeviating party record, Republican Senators whose domestic and foreign policies are much like his own are obstructing and opposing his confirmation on the ground that the Loyalty Review Board, when he was its chairman, cleared of disloyalty charges William W. Remington, then an official of the Department of Commerce, now on trial for perjury growing out of charges that he denied to a grand jury former association with the Communist Party. But the terms of Executive Order No. 9835 virtually dictated that clearance.

#### EFFECT OF THE EXECUTIVE ORDER

Former Senator Hiram Bingham, also a Republican, who succeeded Mr. Richardson as Chairman of the LRB, is about to wrestle with the same obstacle in trying to eliminate and bar disloyal persons from the public service. If the Board's terms of reference remain as they are Mr. Bingham may find himself under the same attack as Mr. Richardson.

The sources of the trouble, past and current, are to be found in the circumstances that Executive Order No. 9835 directs the LRB (1) to confine its judgment to whether or not a Government employee is loyal, and (2) bars an adverse judgment on the basis of reasonable doubt of that loyalty or on remote evidence or implication of past disloyalty. Thus, while the LRB members might feel reasonable doubt of an employee's loyalty, or regard a loyal employee as a security risk just the same, or find in the remote evidence grounds for belief that disloyalty still exists, they are under Presidential direction to clear that employee when his case comes before them for review.

Under this directive the Board tried and cleared Remington when Mr. Richardson was Chairman. But, regardless of whether this clearance is supported by the New York City jury, Mr. Bingham also will be similarly limited in other trials, and probably he also will be attacked by fellow Republicans.

#### BROADER STANDARDS OF 1942

The ban on "reasonable doubt" of loyalty as an adverse finding was not included in the civil-service regulations of 1942, which grew out of President Roosevelt's Executive Orders Nos. 9063 and 9243. This made it possible to bar or dismiss Federal employees on such grounds, which also permitted consideration of the risk element of security as well as loyalty. The LRB under both Messrs. Richardson and Bingham has no such latitude because its standards of judgment were promulgated in 1947 when the threat of world communism to American security was not recognized by the Executive to the degree it is today. If these standards are not changed from the 1947 to the 1942 type, the Bingham board will have the same experiences it had under Mr. Richardson.

The order of 1947 applies only to executive employees. It can be applied and enforced only if, "on all the evidence, reasonable grounds exist for belief that the person involved is disloyal to the Government of the United States" now, and the fact that the Board may consider him loyal but a security risk does not give it basis for an adverse finding. Obedient to this order, the LRB has consistently found that youthful, including student, activities and associations were insufficient grounds for a judgment of disloyalty if there was nothing in the employee's record of later years to indicate a

continuation of such earlier beliefs and activities.

#### APPROVED BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

The Executive order of 1947 uses the words "loyalty" and "disloyalty" in all sections, even to the authority given the LRB to make rules and regulations relating to "employee loyalty." Hence, it being plain that the Board is given no other test for investigation and adjudication, the LRB at no time has sought to deal with the question of security. Its members concluded that, while an employee's morals or habits or lack of discretion or personal associations might readily raise the issue of security risk, these could not be used to determine the issue of loyalty with which alone it was empowered to deal.

But Mr. Richardson asked the Attorney General if this interpretation by the Board of Executive Order No. 9835 was correct, just to be certain it wasn't too literal and legalistic. The Attorney General specifically affirmed the interpretation. That was the standard by which it judged the cases of Remington and others, and that is the standard by which Mr. Bingham will have to abide if the order is not expanded and he decides to try to work within the close limitation of its terms.

If and when the Republican Senators who, with some Democrats, are holding up confirmation of Mr. Richardson and his fellow appointees begin their hearings on the subject, prior to advising the Senate whether to approve or disapprove all or some members of the Subversive Activities Control Board, these pertinent facts will enter the official record.

#### A TRIBUTE TO GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR, AND AN ESTIMATE OF THE RESULTS OF THE ACTION IN KOREA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words to mark an important occasion which will occur tomorrow. I understand that the Senate will not be in session tomorrow, so I speak on this matter today.

On Friday, January 26, America will celebrate the seventy-first birthday of one of her greatest sons, a man in whom we in Wisconsin take particular pride because of his deep roots in our State. I refer, of course, to Gen. Douglas MacArthur, supreme commander of the United Nations forces in Korea, chief of America's military occupation of Japan, hero of Bataan.

Because of the million of words which have been written about this distinguished soldier and administrator, there is very little one can add at this point. It is enough to say, however, that history undoubtedly will honor him not only as one of the great men of our times, but as one of the greatest Americans in our entire history.

Most Americans believed that General MacArthur's exploits in World War II probably would represent the climax in his career: his amazing return from Australia, up the chain of Pacific islands; his brilliant strategy in the Pacific campaign, which—with a minimum of casualties—ended with the signing of the Japanese surrender aboard the battleship *Missouri*. Those achievements seemed to be the greatest of his career. But still greater triumphs were in the making. General MacArthur's accomplishments in Japan are the work of an administrative genius. When we compare those accomplishments with what our administrators have been doing in



Europe, we reach that definite conclusion. At noon today I had lunch with three of Japan's great leaders, one of whom was governor of the Bank of Japan. In speaking about MacArthur, he said, "MacArthur we respect, we honor; we have an affectionate regard for him. We almost love him."

LET US NOT BE TOO QUICK IN RENDERING JUDGMENT

What about Korea, Mr. President? This gives me an opportunity to say something about judgment. Let us not be too quick in rendering judgment in regard to the Korean situation. It has been fashionable for certain swivel-chair generals—and I refer in particular to civilians who pretend to be all-wise in military affairs—to assume that Korea is an entire fiasco, a closed book, with absolutely no redeeming points at all. I believe that Korea was a trap for us, of course; and I believe that we fell into it. I believe that the Russians purposely had their representatives keep away from the United Nations. However, those things do not prove that the action in Korea has been a fiasco. We should realize that the final chapter in the Korean story has not as yet been written. Let us not forget that, although at first there was practically universal criticism of our military policy, at the time when American forces fell back under the North Korean attack in the first few days of the war, yet at long last the United States mounted its counteroffensive, and we saw in the brilliant landing at Inchon the finest type of military master stroke. Let us not be so quick, therefore, in attempting to render final judgment.

THERE ARE SOME ASSETS IN THE KOREAN VENTURE

Yes, Mr. President, although the news from Korea has been grim, and is today, let us not forget that for all of its liabilities—and they are many and grave—there have been some notable successes in the Korean venture thus far.

I personally, of course, have pointed out that unfortunately our Korean adventure seems to have been playing into Russia's hands.

What is Russia's technique? It is, first, penetration by every known means, including propaganda, fear, hatred, division. By those means Russia took over 150,000,000 people in Europe. That is the first prong of the Russian technique. By means of the same prong she tried to penetrate Southern Korea, where the United Nations had been building up the country and had succeeded to such an extent that the Southern Koreans declined, despite the Russian propaganda penetration, to choose the Communist philosophy or way.

Then Russia used the second prong of her technique. She sent into action one of her stooges, the North Koreans, whom she had armed and equipped. After we defeated the North Koreans, Russia called on another of her stooges, the Chinese Communists. Russia has stooges all over the world.

Russia has not yet used the third prong of her technique, and probably she will not use it until she has exhausted her stooges.

Mr. President, I have spoken of the fact that there are some assets in the

case of the Korean adventure, and I shall enumerate them. At this point I must say that all of us have followed with sorrow the casualty lists, as the cost in human lives has mounted higher and higher. Yet, as I have said, there is an assets side of the Korean ledger. What are the assets?

KOREA HAS PROVED RED CONSPIRACY

First. For one thing, the invasion by North Korea and then by Red China has shown the American people, if any further proof was necessary, the true nature of the Communist conspiracy to control the world.

Mr. President, in my humble opinion, that caused a tremendous explosion in the minds of the people of the United States and in the minds of the people of the world.

Second. It has alerted America, so that now we are embarked on a gigantic preparedness program, a program by which we will make sure, we trust, that never again will our country be caught in a Pearl Harbor-like surprise attack, helpless and defenseless, either within or without. We might not have embarked on that preparedness program, had it not been for the developments in Korea.

Third. Equally important, the Korean invasion has shown all the free peoples of the world how Russia intends to use her stooges for the second stage of her assault on the West or in Iran or Turkey or Greece.

Korea has brought about a reawakening of the Western Allies, as I pointed out in an address delivered in New York last Wednesday night. France, England, and other countries have stepped up their plans for an increased number of infantry divisions, and have increased their appropriations for defense purposes. Turkey has proved her proud mettle in combat.

KOREA HAS PROVED MILITARY MIGHT IS CRUCIAL

Fourth. Korea has shown that military strength in our allies must be of major concern to us. Korea has shown how imperatively necessary it is for us therefore to mobilize Japan, Germany, Spain, and other countries which we have not adequately utilized to date, so that they can become bastions of defense—military assets, rather than liabilities.

Mr. President, if we consider the situation which existed a few months ago, we remember that at that time we were complacent and unalert, just as we were at the time of Pearl Harbor. Think of the change which has occurred as of today. No one questions the need; no one is doubtful as to the seriousness of the situation; today no one doubts why Russia has built snorkel submarines and is building bombs. No, Mr. President; today we are alert, we are going to work; we are embarking upon a broad production program; we are going to be ready for whatever may happen.

UNITED NATIONS MAY YET BE VINDICATED

Fifth. The North Korean invasion galvanized the United Nations into action. While, more recently, when we have suffered reverses, the UN has shown itself to be dragging its feet in labeling Red China as an aggressor, it is our prayer that the United Nations will yet vindicate

itself. It is our prayer that it will find within itself the capacity to be adequate to the present situation.

It is the hope of the world that in this challenging period the United Nations will not fail us. This is no time for us to abandon the United Nations. It is the great beacon of hope for mankind. Through the ages, hungering humanity has sought peace. Is the United Nations to be but another wreck on the shore of time? I say, Mr. President, let not America wreck it. Let us give hope. Let us also appreciate that the nations which are members of the United Nations are seeking help, and are fearful. They need our strength. They need our guidance. Yes, it is easy enough for us, with two oceans between us and the Russian bear, to be supremely confident at times perhaps; but we should be considerate of those who are next door, only a matter of minutes from the Russian airplanes. Let us be thoughtful of them, and helpful. But let us build toward security and adequacy.

KOREA HAS SHOWN UNITED STATES STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

Sixth. The Korean adventure has shown us both the strengths and weaknesses of our fighting forces. It has proved that the American soldier, given the right equipment, is the greatest fighting man in the world. It has proved how our Army, Navy, and Air Forces can cooperate brilliantly, such as in the masterful evacuation of Hungnam. It has shown that American jet planes are the superiors of at least those Russian-made jets which have been brought into action. We do not know whether they are her best planes or not.

At the same time, Korea has proved that much of our military thinking, at least in situations involving that type of terrain, was inadequate, that our weapons could be considerably improved, and that strategies of land warfare should be revised accordingly.

Someone has said that Korea is the Spain of a third world war. I trust that will not prove to be true. I am hoping that what has happened in Korea will teach the Russians that, with the revitalized spirit of the free people of earth, this is no time for her to start a third world war.

KOREA HAS WRECKED RED CHINESE TIMETABLE

Seventh. By our action in Korea we have already destroyed much of the flower of at least one corps of the Chinese Red army. We have pinned down a tremendous number of Chinese Red troops which might otherwise be prepared for action against Formosa, south-east Asia, and so forth.

These are some of the assets amid the liabilities, if we may call them that, of the Korean venture on the world chessboard. Who knows what the imponderable events of tomorrow may prove about Korea?

So I contend, Mr. President, that all these various factors must be weighed in the balance against the admitted liabilities of the Korean chapter.

At this time, because we recognize that all the world is a chessboard, a play here has certain repercussions on another

play yonder. Certainly by our own invention the world has been contracted, so to speak. With our planes, which attain speeds of from 900 to 1,000 miles an hour, and with our weapons, the world is now a small place. We must realize that things have changed even since 1939.

At this time we can recall the philosophy of early American patriots, who warned us that those who expected to enjoy the blessings of freedom would also have to expect to make sacrifices to maintain freedom. "Tyranny," said Tom Paine, "like hell, is not easily conquered."

#### LET NOT DOUGLAS MAC ARTHUR BE BELITTLED

Let not the armchair generals belittle, ridicule, and defame one of our greatest sons, Douglas MacArthur, a man who has hardly had the freedom of action worthy of his role. Actually, he needs no defense on my part or on the part of any other American. Why? Because his thundering actions and his epic successes speak louder than all the words which we could possibly utter in his behalf.

The American people have not lost and will not lose their faith in this great American. He stands as a great pillar of strength. His patriotism is unquestioned; his vigor, his alertness, his enterprise, in spite of advanced years, are respected by every American. His years are not really advanced. I saw a man yesterday, who is, I believe, 9 years older than General MacArthur—Mr. Cordell Hull, and his mind is as keen as a razor's edge. So is Gen. Douglas MacArthur's. He is respected by every American.

As one Wisconsinite to another, I salute General MacArthur. I pray that the day may not be far distant when in a more peaceful and more secure time, his mission completed, he may return to these shores. Then may he receive the honors at first hand which are so deservedly his, after his long years of absence from his native land.

#### EUROPEAN PREPARATION AND WILL TO RESIST RUSSIAN AGGRESSION

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, last December I sent a letter to the President of the United States requesting that he provide Congress with the facts regarding the condition of Europe's preparedness and its will to resist Russian aggression. At that time I was confronted on the one hand by reports that the people of Western Europe were demoralized and sick of war, and that they lacked the will to stand up to Soviet aggression. On the other hand, there were reports, largely advanced by the administration, that the people of Europe had the will to resist Communist aggression, that their courage and determination were vibrant and alive, and that all that was needed was an assurance of American backing.

When I dispatched my letter to the President it was my hope that he would promptly provide the information at the disposal of the executive department regarding the preparedness of the European Nations to defend themselves from a military point of view, and also whether or not they were able to unite as one economic unit so that their resources

would be integrated for defense purposes.

It seemed to me then, as it does now, that with the sharp conflict between the views of former President Hoover and those of the administration with respect to the will of Europe to defend itself and its state of preparedness, a statement of facts by the administration on which its conclusions that our western allies meant business was founded, was needed, if we were to act intelligently.

It should be apparent that if Europe does not have the will to defend itself, that if its morale is so low that it will not fight, and that if it has done practically nothing to prepare itself against an attack, then the United States would be justified in pursuing the course proposed by Mr. Hoover.

On the other hand, if our European allies are firm in their will to fight, and are preparing their defenses with all the resources at their command, we should then be bound by the terms of the Atlantic Pact to support them with such efforts in both an economic and military way as we should deem necessary under the circumstances. In other words, our future course of conduct in Western Europe, and in fact as a part of the defense of the free world against aggression, would largely be determined by what the true situation is in Europe with regard to the questions which have been raised.

Under date of January 23, 1951, the President replied to my letter of last December. He informed me that he had been undertaking the preparation of a reply containing information of the type I had requested, but that events have been moving so rapidly he had now come to the conclusion that the purpose of my letter could best be served by waiting a short time until General Eisenhower returns from Europe.

The President went on to say that General Eisenhower no doubt will have a large amount of new information which he will give to Congress soon after he reaches Washington and that that information will do a great deal to help clarify the questions which I raised in my letter.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, a letter which I addressed to the President, and his reply thereto, to which I have referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to thank the President of the United States for his letter. It is good to know that it is the President's intention to have General Eisenhower report to the Congress as well as to the executive branch. The whole Nation wants the facts first-hand. It is my hope that General Eisenhower, on his short and hurried trip to Europe, will be able to get first-hand information on the vital questions raised.

Mr. President, the condition of our relationships with the world's non-Communist nations should give us cause for

alarm. There are indications that some of the nations we thought were standing by us in courage and determination are faltering as the time for decision approaches.

Great Britain, our great wartime friend and ally, is divided between its hesitancy at offending the United States and its fear of Red China and her Russian ally. Present reports indicate that it is doubtful the British Government will support United Nations condemnation of Communist China as an aggressor. The British Government hesitates even while her troops are fighting and dying in the battle against armed Communist aggression in Korea.

At the very moment that India seeks 2,000,000 tons of American wheat, her Prime Minister has rebuked the United States for its sponsorship of a United Nations resolution to brand Red China an aggressor in Korea. The Government of India is in the forefront of the drive to admit Red China to the United Nations, even while Red China is conducting a war of aggression against the United Nations in Korea.

The Arab states, who are closely tied to Great Britain by bonds of friendship and trade, are joined with Great Britain and India in the desire to avoid indicting Red China as an aggressor in Korea.

Some of our friends and allies have extended diplomatic recognition to the government of Red China. There are repeated reports that Great Britain and some of our other friends are engaged in brisk and profitable trade with Red China.

Some of the items being sent to Communist China are suitable for military use and will therefore aid the Communist Chinese armed forces in their aggression in Korea and planned aggression elsewhere in Asia.

Under the North Atlantic Pact the United States joined with the nations of Western Europe in a defensive alliance in which it was agreed that an attack on one of the member nations is in effect an attack on all, and that all will promptly come to the assistance of any member which has been subjected to an armed attack. In that respect, let me quote paragraph 1 of article 5 of the treaty. That paragraph is the pledge of mutual assistance which all nations have taken who are members of the North Atlantic Treaty organization:

The parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all; and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in the exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the party or parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area.

The North Atlantic Pact recognizes the right of self-defense as a sovereign right of all nations. It in no way impairs any signatory nation's right to defend itself from an armed attack by the use of armed force.



The North Atlantic Pact is a pledge of mutual assistance in the event of an attack. It imposes an obligation on each of the signatory powers to come to the assistance of any one or more of the pact members who have been attacked. There is no such obligation, however, if the attack is not made in the general area of the North Atlantic and North America.

In respect to the geographical area of the world covered by the North Atlantic Pact and in which an attack must occur before the obligation of mutual assistance comes into play, let me quote article 6 of the treaty:

For the purpose of article 5 an armed attack on one or more of the parties is deemed to include an armed attack on the territory of any of the parties in Europe or North America, on the Algerian departments of France, on the occupation forces of any party in Europe, on the islands under the jurisdiction of any party in the North Atlantic area north of the Tropic of Cancer, or on the vessels or aircraft in this area of any of the parties.

The North Atlantic Pact is not a pledge by the United States that the United States by itself will take on the burden of defending Western Europe. It is a pledge of cooperative effort in mutual self-defense, carrying obligations which all must meet.

The ties of friendship and mutual assistance in the North Atlantic Pact can be no stronger than the will of the individual nations who joined together to bring the pact into being. The pact can be no stronger than its weakest link. When one or more of its members falters in its dealings with a common enemy and accepts the doctrine of appeasement, it strikes at the strength of the pact itself.

In the past few days the British-Asian-Arab bloc of nations seems to have deserted us in the fight against Communist aggression. Behind the leadership of the Labor-Socialist Government of Great Britain, these nations have joined together and helped bring about the tabling of a resolution to brand Communist China an aggressor in Korea. Thus some of the very nations who are joined with us for mutual assistance in defense against Communist aggression in the North Atlantic area have served notice that they are unwilling to stand with us against Communist aggression in Asia. Thus the nations which have accepted our economic bounty and military assistance, and who still stand with hands outstretched, seem determined to let us stand alone in this hour of peril in Asia.

The lesson of recent events is clear. The people of the United States realize that if their Nation is to survive, it must make itself strong quickly. As its first objective, the United States must build up its own strength within its own borders and must raise a wall of ships and planes which no aggressor can pierce. That must be done quickly and at all costs; that must be our first objective.

In addition to the building up of America as a great inner fortress of freedom, the United States must have defense bases beyond its territorial limits and must join with allies abroad. These allies must be friends whose objectives are the same as ours. They must be en-

dowed with courage and determination and the will to fight, if necessary, to maintain their freedom. Once having found such allies, we must do all we can to help them to effective defense without sacrificing our own defenses.

The very survival of our Nation may well be in the balance. The decisions which are to be made should be made not by the executive branch alone, not by the Senate alone, but by the people of the United States and their Government in all its branches, acting together in unity, determination, and common purpose.

#### EXHIBIT 1

DECEMBER 29, 1950.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Public debate over our foreign policy, and particularly our relationship to the Atlantic Pact Nations, points up conflicting statements of facts as they pertain to Europe's desire and efforts to resist the rising tide of communism.

Mr. Hoover says in effect that Continental Europe has not in 3 years of our aid developed that unity of purpose and that willpower necessary for its own defense; that the minds of Western Europeans are confused with fears and disunity and that, notwithstanding our generous help to this date, they have failed to develop a unity of purpose or organization. They vacillate, Mr. Hoover says, in the belief that they are in little danger and hope to avoid being a theater of war, and because of this state of mind they have done practically nothing to prepare their defense.

Many able newspaper correspondents support Mr. Hoover's conclusions on the European state of mind as well as his conclusions on their preparedness or lack of preparedness.

If the press quoted you correctly, Mr. President, you sharply contradicted Mr. Hoover's statements. Thus, an issue over facts is raised which serves only to greatly confuse the Members of Congress and the American public. Surely it would be helpful if we could agree on what the true situation is. The American people are justified in asking for the facts and not conclusions based on alleged facts. If they know the truth, I am certain they can be relied upon to exercise proper judgment.

To get the actual situation, Mr. President, the American people should be fully informed by you and your Secretary of State, through answers to the following questions:

What progress, if any, has been made by our European Allies in preparing themselves to meet a Communist attack since the ratification of the Atlantic Pact some 16 months ago?

I hope this question, as far as security will permit, will be answered not only with respect to paper plans, but to actual increases of armament as well as the mobilization of fighting divisions.

Is there a public sentiment of major proportions in Western European countries in favor of a neutral position in any war in which the United States and Russia and her satellites would be involved?

To illustrate, is there a growing anti-American feeling in England which expresses itself in the statement, "Let America fight her own wars"?

Ludwell Denny, foreign news correspondent reports that there is such a sentiment in England. Is he right?

And only today, Mr. Denny reports from London on European sentiment:

"The public in almost all countries—Norway is an exception—is either lukewarm to rearmament or openly hostile." Can this possibly be true?

Only a few days ago you were reported as declaring, "Our allies mean business." Is that based on mere promises for future

action, or have they put into effect measures which will establish such a claim?

What, if anything, have our European allies done to bring about an economic union as contemplated by the ECA program?

What concessions, if any, has this administration made to our Western European allies in the Far East?

What arrangements have been made with our allies concerning the division and allocation for civilian and military use of strategic materials?

What concessions, if any, has this administration made concerning the financing of the rearmament of Western Europe in proportion to the contributions of our allies? There seems to be no point in shuffling hand-out programs by announcing the termination of ECA on one hand and the gift of \$12,000,000,000 in armaments on the other. We desperately need to know what the European nations are determined to do for themselves.

What is the maximum manpower potential of the Western European nations themselves which is available for the defense of Europe, and what proportion of that available manpower are they willing to enlist in the program?

What is the basic military defense strategy underlying the North Atlantic Pact? Does it call for the defense of anti-Soviet Europe or just for part of Western Europe?

There are other questions, Mr. President, which might bring out more of the facts with respect to our foreign policy, but those I have submitted, I believe will cover the main points now in controversy. In presenting these questions to you, I have a feeling that no revelation of defense secrets need be involved in giving the American people much needed information. You, of course, will have to be the judge as to what may properly be said.

May I submit that if anything has been done to build up European defenses, that fact should be revealed to offset the damaging statements that have been made repeatedly not only by the press, but semi-officially, that little, if anything, has been done to this date. Giving the American people the facts that substantial progress has been made, if such is the case—not theories or promises—will do more to restore the confidence of the people in our present policies with respect to our defense preparations in the Atlantic area than all the glittering promises our diplomats can make for future action.

In Scriptural language, we may say that our European allies should prove their faith by their works.

When we adopted the Atlantic Pact, it became the law and, as a loyal American, I have supported that pact as the law of my country. Even though I voted against it because reservations protecting the constitutional right of Congress to declare war were not adopted, yet it became our plan of defense and should be given every opportunity to succeed. But, with many other Americans, I have heard and read with grave misgivings reports which indicated that our Allies were actually becoming isolationists and were not making progress toward building their defenses, but were yielding to heavy public pressure that they stay out of any controversy or war which might eventually arise between us and Russia and her satellites.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I sincerely believe that with the facts in your possession which are not available to the rest of us, you may be able to clear up much of the misunderstanding which now exists. If the situation is actually better than it has been pictured, then the people ought to know it. On the other hand, if the state of affairs in Europe is as dangerous as Mr. Hoover believes it to be, the fact ought to be known and considered in our final determination of what our foreign policy should be.

For your convenience, I am enclosing a copy of a speech which I delivered in the Senate on December 22. It contains a more complete statement of the matters discussed in this letter.

Yours very respectfully,  
ARTHUR V. WATKINS.

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, January 23, 1951.  
The Honorable ARTHUR V. WATKINS,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: Since receiving your letter of December 29, I have been undertaking the preparation of a reply containing information of the type you requested.

Events have been moving so rapidly, however, that I have come to the conclusion that the purpose of your letter will be best served by waiting a short time until General Eisenhower returns. He will have a large amount of new information which he will give the Congress soon after he reaches Washington. I think this information will do a great deal to help clarify the questions you raised.

I hope this will be agreeable to you. If you desire to discuss this matter with me, I will be glad to see you.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now adjourn until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 29, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 25 (legislative day of January 8), 1951:

##### INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Frank A. Southard, Jr., of New York, to be United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund for a term of 2 years and until his successor has been appointed. (Reappointment.)

##### COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following-named officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for permanent appointment to the grades indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

##### TO BE ENSIGNS

Barbour C. Stokes, Jr., effective January 18, 1950.

Robert E. Williams, effective March 7, 1951.  
Michael C. Fox, effective March 18, 1951.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, January 25 (legislative day of January 8), 1951:

##### DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Herbert L. Pugh, Medical Corps, United States Navy, to be Surgeon General and Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

##### IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 38 OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT, AS AMENDED

##### To be major generals of the line

Maj. Gen. Harry Lynn Bolen, O185986, to date from October 26, 1950.

Maj. Gen. Curtis Dion O'Sullivan, O113537, to date from October 26, 1950.

##### To be brigadier generals of the line

Brig. Gen. James William Cook, O298148, to date from October 26, 1950.

Brig. Gen. Vincent Paul Coyne, O236410, to date from August 28, 1950.

Brig. Gen. Roy Albert Green, O226513, to date from October 26, 1950.

Brig. Gen. William Henry Naylor, O265997, to date from August 28, 1950.

##### To be brigadier generals, Adjutant General's Corps

Brig. Gen. James Aloysius Murphy, O143370, to date from June 1, 1950.

Brig. Gen. Ralph Julian Olson, O232882, to date from October 26, 1950.

Brig. Gen. Fred Calvin Tandy, O206131, to date from October 26, 1950.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE GRADES AND CORPS SPECIFIED, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 506 OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947 (PUBLIC LAW 381, 80TH CONG.), TITLE II OF THE ACT OF AUGUST 5, 1947 (PUBLIC LAW 365, 80TH CONG.), AND PUBLIC LAW 36, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, AS AMENDED BY PUBLIC LAW 514, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, SUBJECT TO PHYSICAL QUALIFICATION

##### To be major

Raymond Maret, MC, O329011.

##### To be captains

Blanche C. Albright, ANC, N728932.

Edythe Alt, ANC, N742202.

Ida B. Ayer, ANC, N768699.

Dorothy J. Barber, ANC, N735521.

Jane T. Becker, ANC, N728047.

Grace D. Boisvert, ANC, N730776.

Dorothea V. Bowers, ANC, N721221.

Margarita E. Breton, ANC, N783005.

Mary C. Bryan, ANC, N726867.

Doyle E. Burns, DC, O1775377.

Frances E. Cale, ANC, N763747.

James D. Caskie, MC, O1705710.

Elizabeth S. Chamberlin, ANC, N757010.

Dorothy M. Chartrau, ANC, N733447.

Gertrude M. Classen, ANC, N775131.

Ethel W. Coeling, WMSC, M516.

Edward F. Counts, Jr., MC, O935617.

Gladys M. Crosno, ANC, N736195.

Myrtle A. Crosswell, ANC, N771131.

Elizabeth J. Davies, WMSC, M249.

June M. Dickie, ANC, N751533.

Mary L. Dombrosky, ANC, N723550.

Helen I. Dunne, ANC, N726819.

Ruth Edenfield, ANC, N767392.

Margaret M. Egan, ANC, N722650.

Vera A. Enquist, ANC, N736267.

Gladys M. Eppright, ANC, N779972.

Adeline C. Evans, ANC, N767057.

Mercedes M. Fischer, ANC, N732315.

Georgia I. Fleet, ANC, N723382.

Janet M. Fleming, ANC, N741892.

Lillian Fore, ANC, N779252.

Gladys O. Fowlie, ANC, N727976.

Sybil C. Freiman, ANC, N726035.

Edith F. Frew, ANC, N742165.

Mary H. Gayle, ANC, N736305.

Rita M. Geis, ANC, N732135.

Beatrice Goldberger, WMSC, R1331.

Mary M. Grant, ANC, N745086.

Mabel Hammariund, ANC, N733333.

Elizabeth T. Hanna, ANC, N727354.

Ebba V. Hanson, ANC, N787479.

Levenia E. Hill, ANC, N764708.

Alice E. Holland, ANC, N723789.

Edith E. Hopkins, WMSC, R2222.

George W. Houck, MC, O1725757.

M. Marguerite Huff, ANC, N724643.

Helen F. Kay, ANC, N743771.

Marie Kimmert, ANC, N736074.

Nancy B. Kinsey, ANC, N724922.

Mary S. Kollner, ANC, N744834.

Olga R. Kugler, ANC, N756911.

Janie L. Lassiter, ANC, N763875.

Marguerite M. Lavin, ANC, N759550.

Mary S. Lawrence, WMSC, M601.

Margaret L. Loucks, ANC, N723105.  
Martha C. McLaughlin, ANC, N743335.  
Florence C. Malone, ANC, N720370.  
Maria L. Marshall, ANC, N728687.  
Dorothy C. Martone, ANC, N759391.  
Beulah L. Marwine, ANC, N745567.  
Margaret E. Megill, ANC, N724008.  
Hubert W. Merchant, DC, O487380.  
Mary C. Morris, ANC, N744161.  
Clara R. Oberg, ANC, N730086.  
Marie A. Oswald, ANC, N779052.  
Floyce Parham, ANC, N775813.  
Sylvia R. Pavlovich, ANC, N741620.  
Loucelle E. Peck, ANC, N758550.  
Alice E. Pettengill, ANC, N721998.  
Ollie W. Plunkett, ANC, N745327.  
Mary M. Preston, ANC, N763725.  
Eleanor R. Reimers, WMSC, R1087.  
Mary E. Riley, ANC, N772827.  
Sophia D. Sedor, ANC, N761695.  
Geraldine S. Smith, ANC, N724120.  
Thelma I. Sooman, ANC, N783778.  
Barbara C. Sox, ANC, N727839.  
Ruth M. Steenburgh, ANC, N756235.  
Alice E. Still, ANC, N742943.  
Ida R. Strickland, WMSC, R408.  
Ruth M. Stroemer, ANC, N772941.  
Mary A. Taney, ANC, N755309.  
Elizabeth P. Taylor, ANC, N728297.  
Gladys A. Theiss, ANC, N736098.  
Jeanne M. Treacy, ANC, N724830.  
Celestia H. Uffring, ANC, N767068.  
Fanny Urette, ANC, N730574.  
Eileen M. Waite, ANC, N737274.  
Nellie E. Walls, ANC, N759333.  
Gladys M. Welch, ANC, N731925.  
Margaret H. Wheeler, ANC, N774699.  
Mary E. White, ANC, N752315.  
Althea E. Williams, ANC, N733494.  
Miriam E. Young, ANC, N733473.

##### To be first lieutenants

Mayna R. Allen, ANC, N776564.  
Eugene J. Bell, Jr., JAGC, O989155.  
Angela R. Benda, ANC, N784722.  
Eugene F. Chandler, MC, O976732.  
Betty P. Chellman, WMSC, R2293.  
Edwin T. Cooke, MC, O984778.  
Alyce-Marie C. Cushnie, ANC, N793733.  
Virginia L. Jones, WMSC, R1394.  
Robert L. Massonneau, MC, O975718.  
Dorothy J. Matheson, ANC, N785581.  
Patricia T. Murphy, ANC, N752652.  
Marjorie K. Neuman, ANC, N797941.  
Joseph P. O'Leary, DC, O980923.  
Edwin M. Schmidt, JAGC, O989985.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE GRADE OF SECOND LIEUTENANT, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 506 OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947 (PUBLIC LAW 381, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS), SUBJECT TO PHYSICAL QUALIFICATION

Marion C. Albright, O1179758.  
Raymond H. Beaty, O2021091.  
Ian K. Burgess, O2203170.  
Edwin D. Chavous, O2205567.  
Jack R. Clawson, O978547.  
Harry H. Collier, O2203917.  
Carroll C. Davis, O2202355.  
Eley P. Denson, Jr., O2211054.  
Thomas J. Dilbeck, O967483.  
Earl D. Downing, O2207320.  
Robert C. Ebersberger, O966933.  
Robert C. Effinger, Jr., O2204907.  
Elmer D. Gates, O2201156.  
Angelo Giambusso, AO12799.  
James C. Griffith, A2207065.  
Robert L. Harper, O2704789.  
Gerald G. Hennis, O2202952.  
William J. Hoar, O2200449.  
Ernest P. Hoff, Jr., O971161.  
Edward B. Kenney, O2205222.  
Richard D. Kolter, O973381.  
Keith E. Larsen, O2210833.  
John F. Prendiville, Jr.  
Albert E. Riley.  
Hansel Y. Smith, Jr., O2203902.



APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY NURSE CORPS, REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES, IN THE GRADE OF SECOND LIEUTENANT, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF PUBLIC LAW 36, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

Peggy Sappington, N805037.

#### IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. All medical officers nominated for promotion have been found professionally qualified for promotion as required by law. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (X) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

#### To be majors

##### CHAPLAINS

Ellenbogen, Edward, 18771A.  
Rogers, Vernon Otto, 18770A.

#### To be captains

##### UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Anderson, Robert Seymour, 15199A.  
Andrews, George Allen, 15103A.  
Antosz, Leo Joseph, 15197A.  
Bales, Glenn Edward, 15055A.  
Bartek, Joe John, 15211A.  
Barth, John Craig, 15152A.  
Bathurst, John Forrest, 15144A.  
Blunk, John Robert, 15066A.  
Borbe, Alfred Thomas, 15050A.  
Brazelton, Leslie Felix, 15214A.  
Brock, Arthur Wellington, 15173A.  
Brown, Bernard Leon, 15081A.  
Brown, Henry William, 15225A.  
Bryan, Warren Leroy, 15109A.  
Burke, John Thomas, 15181A.  
Butler, Ralph Joseph, 15142A.  
Campbell, Glenn Vincent, 15070A.  
Carlstrom, Robert Donald, 15098A.  
Cavanaugh, Charles Elmer, Jr., 15200A.  
X Chafin, James Troy, Jr., 15113A.  
Chauret, Colin Joseph Nicholas, 15218A.  
Chmura, Edward, 15077A.  
X Cismowski, Aloysius Michael, 15106A.  
Clark, Frederick A., 15189A.  
Coleman, Fred, 15119A.  
Conway, Jack Melvin, 15124A.  
Corbin, Zane Edwin, 15082A.  
Cox, Harold Donavan, 15068A.  
Daffern, Troy, 15048A.  
Dankof, Karl Elson, 15171A.  
Deschamps, Elzeard John, 15216A.  
X Di Labbio, Paul, 15047A.  
Dix, Roy Arthur, 15111A.  
Doering, Edward Wayne, 15118A.  
Douglas, Logan Albert, 15227A.  
Downey, Richard Forrest, 15190A.  
Drake, William Henry, 15219A.  
Edens, Billy Gene, 15209A.  
Eggleston, John Waller, 15169A.  
Elrod, John Hale, 15187A.  
England, John Brooke, 15188A.  
Englebreton, Robert Edward, 15088A.  
Erickson, Arnold Theodore, 15215A.  
Fairbank, Charles Edward, 15059A.  
Falkenberg, Harold Stanton, 15083A.  
Fisher, Harrison Lee, 15148A.  
Fisher, Robert Jeremy, 15166A.  
Fox, Bob Duane, 15058A.  
French, George Holmes, 15201A.  
X Frost, Douglas Hugh, 15194A.  
Frost, Jack Junior, 15150A.  
Garrison, Keith M., 15180A.  
Gibson, John Raymond, 15222A.  
Glasgow, Thurman Arnold, 15080A.  
X Goldblum, Theodore, 15174A.  
Graham, Harold Bruce, 15183A.  
Graham, Neil James, 15052A.  
Hall, Marvin Russell, 15163A.  
Hanlen, John Wayne, 15195A.  
Hardy, Nathan Chester, 15069A.  
Hargis, Horace Peyton, 15139A.  
X Hartman, Richard John, 15056A.  
Harvey, Theodore Richard, 15204A.  
Hasselbaum, Roth Oscar, 15196A.  
Heller, Richard Frederick, Jr., 15089A.  
Higgins, Richard William, 15153A.  
X Hilburn, John E., 15213A.  
X Hinkle, Arthur Lee, 15061A.  
Hobbs, Robert Alan, 15206A.  
Hoyl, Basil Landon, 15154A.  
Hunt, Hollis Hubert, 15133A.  
X Hunt, Raymond Dale, 15051A.  
Hurley, Raymond Leo, 15054A.  
X Hurrell, Robert Paige, 15138A.  
Hurst, Eugene Edward, 15170A.  
Iannacito, George James, 15101A.  
Jensen, Loyd Eugene, 15074A.  
X Johnson, Haddon, Jr., 15100A.  
X Jones, Paul Daniel, 15146A.  
X Keppeler, Elmer Charles, 15158A.  
Kerr, Teddy Junior, 15179A.  
Lane, Harry Wesley, 15096A.  
Laster, Tom Garrison, 15110A.  
Leone, Joseph Michele, 15102A.  
Lindsey, Wilbur Ross, Jr., 15071A.  
Lozito, Francis Carmel, 15065A.  
Mabrey, Thomas Franklin, 15063A.  
Madara, George Leonard, Jr., 15202A.  
Madsen, Lawrence Edwards, 15092A.  
Maloney, Robert Alphonse, 15078A.  
Martin, Walter Don, 15108A.  
Martin, Warren Harry, 15210A.  
Matthews, Albert McKay, 15131A.  
Mattick, Stephen, 15049A.  
McCulloch, Donald Edward, 15151A.  
McDaniel, Henry Bailey, Jr., 15105A.  
McGill, Allen Keith, 15175A.  
McKee, Donald Eugene, 15149A.  
McKee, William Vincent, 15172A.  
Meintsma, Seward Mortimer, 15127A.  
Melton, Ramon Reeves, 15086A.  
Miller, Francis Leo, 15128A.  
Mitchell, Frank Grover, Jr., 15177A.  
Moore, Robert Edward, 15126A.  
Morrow, Craig Godfrey, 15094A.  
Morrow, Russell Ellis, 15168A.  
Moser, Fred A., Jr., 15141A.  
Mullins, George Herbert, 15067A.  
Myers, Thomas Ellis, 15136A.  
Neuharth, Richard Emanuel, 15182A.  
Nevill, Rex Ferrall, 15162A.  
X Noll, John Roger, 15134A.  
Nourie, Robert Baron, 15114A.  
Ochs, Robert Glen, 15229A.  
O'Grady, Joe Milton, 15164A.  
Parks, Joseph Wayne, Jr., 15212A.  
Pensinger, Wilbur Carl, 15167A.  
Peters, Marvin Leroy Wells, 15057A.  
Plummer, John Augustine, 15087A.  
Poindexter, Walter Edwin, 15205A.  
Popham, Jack Edward, 15097A.  
Preston, William Nathaniel, 15076A.  
Rattle, Joseph Jackson, 15090A.  
X Rayner, Clyde Frederick, 15159A.  
Regis, Edward Robert, 15223A.  
Robinson, Zester William, 15075A.  
Rodriguez, Miguel Ramon, Jr., 15120A.  
Rohr, Charles Edmond, 15117A.  
Rose, Eugene Simon, Jr., 15060A.  
Rose, Franklin, Jr., 15224A.  
Savage, Thomas Potter, 15208A.  
Scheider, Rube Frank, Jr., 15185A.  
Sewell, Jack Kennard, 15130A.  
Sharp, William Carmen, 15160A.  
Sittler, Lloyd Wayne, 15178A.  
Smith, Bernard Cyril, 15112A.  
Smith, Douglas Ray, 15186A.  
Smith, Robert Ritchie, 15191A.  
Sorensen, Glenn Kenneth, 15132A.  
Sparkman, Donald Herrick, 15165A.  
Stewart, William Henry, 15123A.  
Stout, Carl Edward, 15221A.  
Stringer, Thomas Henry, 15135A.  
Stuempfle, Robert Alan, 15125A.  
Svimonoff, Constantine, 15072A.  
Swaim, Thomas Stephen, 15203A.  
Swigler, Adam William, Jr., 15099A.  
X Taylor, Robert Guilford, 15116A.  
Tench, William Cabell, 15115A.  
Thomas, Lyle Scott, 15121A.  
Thomas, Richard Jay, 15147A.  
Thompson, Lyle William, 15228A.  
Thorne, Richard Eugene, 15079A.

Torgesen, Elmer, 15107A.  
Upton, Julian Bernard, 15064A.  
Upton, Thomas Jefferson, 15053A.  
Van Camp, Lawrence Fisher, 15155A.  
Vickery, William Wilson, 15073A.  
Voss, Robert Henry, 15129A.  
Walker, George Thomas, 15161A.  
Wallace, Jamie Walker, Jr., 15207A.  
Warmack, Charles William, 15140A.  
Waterhouse, William Carson, 15104A.  
White, Alan Ralph, 15085A.  
Wienberg, Harold Frank, 15220A.  
Wilhelmi, William Henry, 15095A.  
Willoughby, Albert Milton, Jr., 15156A.  
Wilson, Edward Spaulding, 15217A.  
Wilson, Thomas Lee, 15143A.  
Winn, Earl Hardy, 15157A.  
Wise, Henry Grady, Jr., 15084A.  
Wright, Tandy Allison, 15222A.  
Young, Herbert Lee, 15137A.

#### MEDICAL

Foley, Francis Edward, 19543A.  
Hamilton, Charles Irving, Jr., 19558A.  
Leavel, Boude Bowman, 19542A.  
Payne, John William, 19544A.  
Thornton, Nathaniel Albert, 19583A.

#### MEDICAL SERVICE

Goings, Charles Edward, Jr., 19522A.

#### To be first lieutenants

##### UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Adams, Gordon Sackett, 18186A.  
Adcock, James Kenneth, 20589A.  
Ahrens, George Leo, 17732A.  
Alexander, Ernest Lee, 18143A.  
Allison, Thomas I., 17713A.  
Anderson, Charles Keller, 20616A.  
Anderson, George Olaf, 18184A.  
Anderson, Hunter Wilson, 17737A.  
Anderson, Jack Garner, 18188A.  
Avise, Herbert Jack, 18114A.  
Aust, Abner Maurice, Jr., 20631A.  
Ayres, Frank Lawrence, 18173A.  
Baker, Marshall Erbie, 20675A.  
Baker, Wilson Kirby, Jr., 17740A.  
Baldwin, Richard Allen, 18262A.  
Barns, William Frederick, 20630A.  
Barry, Russell John, 20656A.  
Barter, John Wallace, 18208A.  
Bass, Robert Albert, 20632A.  
Baumann, Robert Price, Jr., 18203A.  
Becker, Bertram David, 17971A.  
Belsner, Gerald Jean, 18251A.  
Bell, Robert Malcolm, 18145A.  
Bennett, George Alfred, 18154A.  
Beno, William George, 18205A.  
Bieber, Robert Warren, 17739A.  
Blanton, Franklin Dickinson, 21458A.  
Blodgett, Henry Parson, Jr., 18214A.  
Blount, Buford Charles, 17699A.  
Bobbitt, Aubrey Malcolm, 20644A.  
Bohannon, James Raymond, Jr., 18146A.  
Boone, Warren Wallace, 17708A.  
Borders, Charles Wesley, 18149A.  
Bostick, Arthur Worth, 18239A.  
Boswell, Marion Lillard, 17719A.  
Bowman, Ralph Irving, Jr., 18209A.  
Boyle, William Fredrick, 17729A.  
Bray, Leslie William, Jr., 18136A.  
Brennan, Joseph Xavier, 17728A.  
Brinson, William Leslie, 18117A.  
Brisley, Bernard Anthony, 18265A.  
Brown, Jack Riley, 20599A.  
Brownfield, Paul Wehrle, 20597A.  
Brumm, Robert Ellsworth, 17717A.  
Burkhart, James Murrell, 18230A.  
Burnett, Elvin Earl, 20601A.  
Burns, Robert Bernard, 17727A.  
Bush, Frederick Eugene, 20643A.  
Busha, George Francis, 20628A.  
Byrn, John Stanford, 18196A.  
Canning, Douglas Strickland, 20577A.  
Chapman, John Monroe, Jr., 17700A.  
Clark, Earl Otis, Jr., 20682A.  
Clements, Ben Hill, Jr., 17733A.  
Clifton, Leecroy, 20650A.  
Collington, Frederick, 20663A.  
Collings, Perry Vermont, 18156A.  
Cook, William, Jr., 18257A.

Cooney, Jack Bernard, 20657A.  
 Cooper, Dewey Glenn, 18260A.  
 Craig, Robert Peter, 20649A.  
 Crosby, Samuel Eugene, Jr., 20612A.  
 Crowley, John McBride, 18217A.  
 Crowther, Frederick Earl, 18221A.  
 Cude, Willis Augustus, Jr., 21463A.  
 Cummins, James Dirickson, Jr., 20618A.  
 Curry, Ralph Jack, 18245A.  
 Davis, Bruce, 18120A.  
 De Gennaro, Carlo Nicola, 20570A.  
 Doe, Irving Chester, 18155A.  
 Doiron, Claude Joseph, Jr., 20596A.  
 Donegan, Charles Edward, 18283A.  
 Doran, Patrick Leo, 18207A.  
 Dotson, Herbert Forrest, Jr., 20587A.  
 DuFault, William Francis, 20680A.  
 DuMontier, Louis Devine, 18171A.  
 Eagle, Comly Joel, 18115A.  
 Eberhardt, Donald Elwin, 18182A.  
 Ecklund, Eugene, 20600A.  
 Eckmann, Frederick Charles, 17718A.  
 Elliott, Donald Ancil, 20636A.  
 Ellzey, J. Murray, 18204A.  
 Ernst, William Joseph, 20609A.  
 Escue, Walter Harbin, 17702A.  
 Eubank, Graydon Knox, 18132A.  
 Fahrney, Richard Lee, 18191A.  
 Farnsworth, Al W., 18229A.  
 Farr, John Wesley, 20660A.  
 Foote, Richard Harold, 18219A.  
 Fowler, Oscar Frank, 20583A.  
 Fraser, Paul Victor, 20654A.  
 Frazier, Max Eugene, 21456A.  
 Gaertner, Adolph, Jr., 20603A.  
 Gallagher, Rial Frederick, 20621A.  
 Geary, James Eugene, 17701A.  
 Gentzler, Robert Francis, 20678A.  
 Gilpin, Harry Duncan, 18124A.  
 Gleaves, Donald Heavner, 18282A.  
 Glines, Carroll Vane, Jr., 20579A.  
 Glover, Jerry C., 20659A.  
 Goppert, Jean Glen, 18167A.  
 Gourley, Edwin Parker, 18181A.  
 Gray, Donald Underwood, Jr., 18223A.  
 Green, Norman Morgan, 18237A.  
 Greene, Sidney, 20658A.  
 Greenamyre, Vernie Baird, 18140A.  
 Gregory, Willie Preston, 18236A.  
 Grifard, Robert Marcel, 18264A.  
 Gruber, Kenneth Willis, 20623A.  
 Haggard, Richard Lowell, 17725A.  
 Hall, Benny Bob, 18272A.  
 Hall, Harvey Preston, 20674A.  
 Hamilton, Calvin Lee, 18139A.  
 Hanigan, Edward James, Jr., 18222A.  
 Hansen, Robert Paul, 18159A.  
 Hanton, John Thomas, 18138A.  
 Hawes, Warren Harding, 18160A.  
 Haynes, Clarence Gilbert, 20653A.  
 Henry, David Watters, Jr., 20590A.  
 Henry, Mervin Lester, 20604A.  
 Herrera, Alfred Charles, 20608A.  
 Hicks, Malcolm Glenn, 18185A.  
 Hill, Marcus Lee, Jr., 20622A.  
 Hinerman, Maurice Elwyn, 18218A.  
 Hink, Harry Devere, 17710A.  
 Hochstetler, George Edward, 18216A.  
 Hoffman, Charles Addison, Jr., 18244A.  
 Holt, Garland Edward, 20607A.  
 Horn, Robert Paul, 17743A.  
 Houghtby, James Kenneth, 18240A.  
 Howes, Lewis Langdon, Jr., 18220A.  
 Humphries, Buford Milton, 18175A.  
 Hurlburt, Dana Follett, 18119A.  
 Hurst, Guy, Jr., 18243A.  
 Hutchinson, Paul Eugene, 18158A.  
 Jensen, Lloyd Kenneth, 20624A.  
 Jensen, Sigurd Lars, Jr., 20651A.  
 Jewell, Malcolm Eugene, 20588A.  
 Johanson, Alvin Lars Anton, 18248A.  
 Johnson, Clarence LaVerne, 18213A.  
 Johnson, George Alvin, 20672A.  
 Jones, David Boone, 18183A.  
 Jones, Donald Alfred, 18157A.  
 Jones, Richard Ernest, 18170A.  
 Jones, William Monroe, 20641A.  
 Kane, Richard Weidner, 17711A.  
 Kar, Edward George, 18252A.  
 Kelly, James Wyatt, 21460A.  
 Kemerling, William Earl, 21460A.  
 Kennedy, Dean Lewis, 18235A.

Kent, Joseph Francis, Jr., 17724A.  
 Kenyon, Benjamin Clarence, Jr., 18215A.  
 Kenyon, Donald Edward, 18268A.  
 Kester, Clifford Daniel, 18163A.  
 King, Edwin Vernon, 20585A.  
 Kirschman, Iran Paul, 18258A.  
 Kohrman, Elwood Netherton, 20602A.  
 Latta, Arthur W., 18273A.  
 Lauterbach, Harris Young, 18256A.  
 Lawson, Francis Robert, 20606A.  
 Lewis, Oliver Wendell, 18227A.  
 Light, Herbert Myron, 18128A.  
 Lineham, Thomas Uriah, Jr., 18112A.  
 Little, David Lee, 18253A.  
 Littlewood, Theodore Peterson, 20642A.  
 Lloyd, Glenn Howard, 18226A.  
 Lockhart, George Andrew, Jr., 20594A.  
 Locklear, James Quinton, 18133A.  
 Loman, William Thomas, Jr., 20669A.  
 Long, Paul Henry, 20635A.  
 Long, Robert Francis, 18142A.  
 Lopez, Donald Sewell, 18164A.  
 Luber, Vernon Norton, 18127A.  
 Lunos, Austin Edward, 20645A.  
 Magill, Francis William, 20652A.  
 Maher, Thomas Joseph, 20655A.  
 Malloy, William James, 18197A.  
 Mandina, Sidney Reginald I., 18125A.  
 Marshall, Sidney Currier, 18206A.  
 Martin, Eugene, Jr., 18233A.  
 McNally, Paul Edward, 20581A.  
 McBride, Hugh Walker, 17736A.  
 McCleary, George Carlton, 17735A.  
 McCully, Robert Humes, 18274A.  
 McGaughey, Donald Keith, 20662A.  
 McGowan, Samuel Benjamin, 20572A.  
 McKay, Allen Fraser, 20613A.  
 McMinis, Jonathan Burns, 18249A.  
 McNeil, Edwin Evan, 18192A.  
 Melton, Carl Mudgett, 18190A.  
 Melucas, Paul Joseph, 20640A.  
 Melvin, Robert Elwood, 18193A.  
 Meredith, Jim Tom, 17706A.  
 Metino, Robert Francis, 18224A.  
 Mertely, Frank, 18201A.  
 Miller, Edgar Cornelius, 20614A.  
 Miller, John William, 18198A.  
 Miller, Sidney Harry, 21459A.  
 Mills, Arthur Julius, 18180A.  
 Mills, James Edward, Jr., 18281A.  
 Moehle, Charles Fred, 18131A.  
 Moir, James Ferriss, 17712A.  
 Monaco, Anthony William, Jr., 20605A.  
 Montgomery, Bill Alexander, 17705A.  
 Montgomery, Joe Sheldon, 20633A.  
 Moore, Jack Kenneth, 18135A.  
 Moore, James Conway, Jr., 20664A.  
 Moore, Richard Raymond, 19795A.  
 Moore, Winston Eugene, 17722A.  
 Morton, Walter Pickney, Jr., 18129A.  
 Mullan, Alfred William, Jr., 17709A.  
 Munns, Orlin Charles, 18199A.  
 Myers, Andrew Jackson, Jr., 20769A.  
 Nannay, James Thomas, 18177A.  
 Neville, Harry Walter, 17704A.  
 Newgarden, George Joseph, 3d, 20591A.  
 Newton, Frederick Carter, 18228A.  
 Niemczyk, Julian Martin, 20671A.  
 Nole, Jack Dean, 20598A.  
 O'Donnell, William Joseph, 20574A.  
 O'Halloran, Christopher John, 18259A.  
 Olivera-Barroso, Manuel, 17744A.  
 Orillion, Arthur Joseph, Jr., 20593A.  
 Paige, Carl Addison, 18241A.  
 Payant, Peter, 18232A.  
 Pedersen, Stanley Cartwright, 20617A.  
 Pendergraft, Wesley Lael, 18242A.  
 Penick, Everett Smith, Jr., 18234A.  
 Perry, James Wallace, 20673A.  
 Perry, Roland Archibald, 18231A.  
 Peters, Francis David, Jr., 18137A.  
 Peters, Warren Edmund, 18276A.  
 Peterson, Harry William, 18275A.  
 Pettitt, Bert Edward, Jr., 17698A.  
 Phillips, Thomas Roland, Jr., 18266A.  
 Phillips, Lowell Gene, 18050A.  
 Pierce, Russell Kurtz, Jr., 18118A.  
 Potter, Edward Mac, Jr., 17716A.  
 Prager, Arthur, 20681A.  
 Prager, John William, 20586A.  
 Preller, Gordon Charles, 18144A.  
 Price, Robert Harold, 20571A.

Purcell, Richard McKnight, 18267A.  
 Radcliffe, John Bilton, Jr., 20667A.  
 Raley, Theodore, Maxwell, 18200A.  
 Randall, Richard Clary, 18212A.  
 Raphun, Leland Richards, 18130A.  
 Rath, Leland John, 20620A.  
 Rea, Thomas Samuel, 17707A.  
 Reeder, William Dean, 18161A.  
 Reid, Milton Morgan, 20647A.  
 Reisner, Horace Jackson, 18271A.  
 Rementer, William John, Jr., 18250A.  
 Reuteler, Bruce Ervin, 18168A.  
 Riley, Eldon Stanley, 17703A.  
 Ristau, Siegfried Edward, 18169A.  
 Roderick, Jack Victor, 18122A.  
 Rogers, Dan Terrance, 20665A.  
 Rosenberg, Leslie Benjamin, 18210A.  
 Rotstan, Robert, 17723A.  
 Rutherford, Richard Thomas, 18134A.  
 Salyards, John Albert, Jr., 18279A.  
 Sandvig, Kenneth Leslie, 20595A.  
 Sanna, Francis Patsy, 18148A.  
 Saylor, Warren Daniel, 20637A.  
 Scarpero, William John, 20677A.  
 Schmidt, George Robert, 18202A.  
 Schmidt, Howard Richard, 18123A.  
 Schoeffler, Clifford, 18179A.  
 Schuering, Alvin George, 18166A.  
 Scroggin, Orville Oliver, 3d, 17738A.  
 Schwalier, Charles Dale, 17731A.  
 Schwaner, Charles Fred, 17714A.  
 Selbie, Frederick Donald, Jr., 18225A.  
 Sever, James Edward, 20592A.  
 Sharp, Stuart Mayer, 20629A.  
 Shawhan, Zac George, 20576A.  
 Sheperd, Olen Dean, 20619A.  
 Shewan, Clifford Wayne, 18150A.  
 Shusta, Chester Joseph, 21461A.  
 Simpson, Russell Reavely, 19565A.  
 Singer, Solomon Elias, 20666A.  
 Sিনnett, Jefferson David, 18269A.  
 Slade, William Arthur, 20573A.  
 Smith, Bennie Cozzens, 18141A.  
 Smith, Clark Bridgland, 17730A.  
 Smith, J. B., 20638A.  
 Smith, Mart Gary, Jr., 17976A.  
 Smith, Maurice Hunter, 18172A.  
 Snyder, George Francis, 18153A.  
 Son, Herman Franklin, 17734A.  
 Spencer, Jack, 20661A.  
 Spencer, Loren James, 18255A.  
 Spiro, Bernard, 20627A.  
 Springer, Paul Richard, 17715A.  
 Staples, Johnston Raleigh, 20578A.  
 Stephenson, Wayne Louis, 18238A.  
 Stevens, Jack Duane, 20679A.  
 Stevens, Wendelle Castyle, 18195A.  
 Stewart, Walter Claiborne, Jr., 20639A.  
 Stone, James Samuel, 18247A.  
 Stroff, Michael John, Jr., 20648A.  
 Sturm, Wilmer Ross, 20676A.  
 Suttie, James, 20646A.  
 Talbot, George Edward, 18126A.  
 Taylor, Charles Kersey, Jr., 18113A.  
 Taylor, Jay Johnson, 20580A.  
 Taylor, Joseph Thomas, 20611A.  
 Theus, Lucius, 18270A.  
 Thomas, Alan Brainerd, 17721A.  
 Thompson, George Willard, 17726A.  
 Titus, Frank Alvin, 17741A.  
 Tony, Nicholas, 21464A.  
 Trammell, Andrew Jack, 17720A.  
 Traylor, Horace Cleveland, Jr., 18165A.  
 Urquhart, Charles Thomas, Jr., 20584A.  
 Urquhart, Roland Leslie, Jr., 18162A.  
 Van Bloom, Jay Clark, 18147A.  
 Vega, John William, 18280A.  
 Vincent, Robert Wilson, 20575A.  
 Vogler, Alfred Fritz, 20670A.  
 Volel, Leonard, 18174A.  
 Voris, George Arthur, 17968A.  
 Warner, Walter Eugene, 20610A.  
 Watkins, Marvin Maurice, 17742A.  
 Weeks, Roy Franklyn, Jr., 18189A.  
 Welsh, Stephen Jackson, 20634A.  
 Wendt, Willard Arthur, 20625A.  
 Werber, William Alexander, 18178A.  
 White, Boyd Barnard, 20626A.  
 Wilborn, William Thomas, 18194A.  
 Williams, James Coleman, 18261A.  
 Williams, Lawrence, 18152A.  
 Williams, Wilson Byron, 20668A.



Wilson, Elbert, Jr., 18263A.  
 Wilson, Richard Stanley, 18121A.  
 Winfree, Douglas Woodson, Jr., 18278A.  
 Winner, Donald Carlton, 17973A.  
 Wolfe, Charles Spurgeon, 18176A.  
 Woolf, Simpson Molen, 20569A.  
 Yeager, Paul Meryald, 18116A.  
 Yusevich, John Joseph, 20582A.

#### MEDICAL SERVICE

Allinson, John Nils, 21626A.  
 Beck, William Stanislaus, 21612A.  
 Cook, Raymond John, 21610A.  
 Garner, Walter Frank, 21609A.  
 Herrin, Daniel Monroe, Jr., 21620A.  
 Holihan, Francis Leonard, 21607A.  
 Johnson, John Alfred, 21611A.  
 Little, Herman Ivy, 21616A.  
 Marolf, Kenneth Loyd, 21613A.  
 Nicely, Harry Benson, Jr., 21622A.  
 Rofitis, Robert Jesse, 21623A.  
 Ruffing, Donald Joseph, 21621A.  
 Schult, Harold George, 21617A.  
 Smyth, Kenneth E., 21619A.  
 Weller, William Edgar, 21618A.  
 Whitt, Orbin Russell, 21625A.  
 Winkeblech, Donald Ray, 21624A.  
 Woolf, Henry McCune, 21615A.  
 Zellers, Billy Bob, 21614A.

The following-named officer for promotion in the United States Air Force under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended by Public Law 514, Eighty-first Congress. This officer is subject to physical examination required by law.

× Hetland, Mona Oline, AN1737.

(NOTE.—All officers nominated for promotion to major, captain, and first lieutenant are eligible for permanent promotion during the month of January 1951. Dates of rank will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.)

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

#### To be majors

##### CHAPLAINS

Geigel, Francis Gerald, 18772A.  
 Montcalm, Rosario Louis Ulric, 18773A.

#### To be captains

##### UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Abbott, Charles Whitney, 15243A.  
 Alexander, James Constantine, 15372A.  
 × Amundson, Ray Kenneth, 15367A.  
 Angelakis, Charles, 15362A.  
 Atkinson, Berkeley, 15329A.  
 Baker, William Harding, 15261A.  
 Barthelmess, Robert Platt, 15309A.  
 Baxter, James Marvin, 15301A.  
 Beasley, Roland Clark, 15293A.  
 Benham, Harold Nolan, 15249A.  
 Bennett, Robert Alexander, 15312A.  
 × Beveridge, Richard Franklin, 15352A.  
 Bird, Raymond Casimer, 15256A.  
 Blake, Earl Gifford, 15303A.  
 Blizzard, Alpheus Wesley, Jr., 15290A.  
 Bosworth, Richard Arnold, 15330A.  
 × Boyd, Raymond Andrew, 15295A.  
 Brady, James William, 15285A.  
 Brown, Albert James, 15246A.  
 Butler, John Bryon, 15308A.  
 Butt, Oscar Adolph, 15346A.  
 Cahill, Robert Joseph, 15334A.  
 × Caples, James Edward, 15315A.  
 Cardin, Philip George, 15257A.  
 Carlisle, Paul Leroy, 15306A.  
 Carter, Richard Bruce, 15363A.  
 Chance, James Harvey, 15355A.  
 Collins, Fred Alvin, Jr., 15374A.  
 Collins, Richard Vincent, 15380A.  
 Cook, Harvey Andrew, Jr., 15382A.  
 Croys, Harold Simon, 15277A.

Cundiff, Jack Baker, 15269A.  
 Dacus, Rector Claiborne, 15258A.  
 Dallman, Howard Marvin, 15281A.  
 Danielson, James Elmer, 15323A.  
 Dewberry, Raymond Kenneth, 15344A.  
 Dingivan, Edward Arthur, 15262A.  
 Donohue, William Roberts, 15233A.  
 × Driskell, Claude Thomas, 15381A.  
 Duckett, Wayne George, 15265A.  
 Dunlap, Carl K., 15364A.  
 Evans, George Ollie, 15337A.  
 Evans, Ivor Parry, 15353A.  
 Farrar, George Balch, 15354A.  
 Fernbaugh, Richard Mathew, 15370A.  
 Galligar, Newton Ray, 15379A.  
 Gammons, David Bradley, 15297A.  
 George, Harry Hendrick, 15271A.  
 George, Rex Hall, 15242A.  
 Goetz, Paul Arthur, 15376A.  
 Goodson, John Schley, Jr., 15339A.  
 Grobe, Joe Bailey, 15328A.  
 Harris, Paul Edgar, 15278A.  
 Hart, Frederick Francis, 15351A.  
 Hartzell, James Harris, 15263A.  
 Hayes, Robert Ralph, 15255A.  
 Hearne, Alfred Carroll, 15321A.  
 Hesse, George Albert, Jr., 15311A.  
 Hight, James Russell, 15325A.  
 Holman, Albert Hugh, 15319A.  
 Howze, Stuart Alston, Jr., 15345A.  
 Hoza, Paul Peter, 15268A.  
 Hughes, Lloyd Chalmers, 15267A.  
 Hunt, Robert Louis, 15234A.  
 Hybki, Casimir Francis, Jr., 15273A.  
 Johnson, Milo Claude, 15241A.  
 Jones, John Preston, 15360A.  
 Joseph, Edward Bell, 15366A.  
 Keegan, George Joseph, Jr., 15333A.  
 Kleigass, Earl Lehman, 15292A.  
 Kinder, Richard Oscar, 15245A.  
 Kinkade, Otis Mansel, 15266A.  
 Kirschbaum, Everett Julius, 15317A.  
 Klibbe, Frank William, 15342A.  
 Knight, Lyle Franklin, 15316A.  
 Kocher, John Wayland, 15254A.  
 Kopit, Alfred Leo, 15327A.  
 Kunkel, William Roy, 15231A.  
 Lathrop, Robert Young, 15250A.  
 Latimore, Henry James, Jr., 15368A.  
 Lawrence, Willard James, 15369A.  
 Leonard, William Charles, Jr., 15279A.  
 Lester, Clarence Dewey, 15338A.  
 × Lollis, Clyde Washington, Jr., 15314A.  
 Macken, Gerald Bernard, 15291A.  
 × McCarthy, Peter James, Jr., 15244A.  
 McDonald, Bill, 15358A.  
 McDonald, William Allan, 15350A.  
 McKnight, Douglas Knox, 15365A.  
 Mikell, Emory Allen, 15232A.  
 Miller, Homer Britt, 15322A.  
 Mims, Hayden Pegram, 15375A.  
 × Montone, Neil Anthony, 15248A.  
 Myers, George Harvey, 15324A.  
 Newmeyer, Howard Walter, 15300A.  
 Neill, John Cleo, 15286A.  
 Oberg, John Joseph William, 15348A.  
 Ostrye, Norbert Benedict, 15299A.  
 Parnell, Roland Cleveland, 15313A.  
 Pazin, Peter, 15239A.  
 × Peterson, John Francis, 15356A.  
 Pollyea, Albert, 15275A.  
 Prichard, Artist Hudson, Jr., 15326A.  
 Provancha, Earl Deloss, 15383A.  
 Queen, Thomas Walter, Jr., 15335A.  
 Raymer, John Cecil, Jr., 15310A.  
 Reinert, Robert Amandus, 15270A.  
 Rieker, Thomas Henry, 15251A.  
 Rhodehamel, Wesley Richard, 15347A.  
 Roberts, John Wendell, 15280A.  
 Rodgers, John Robert, 15341A.  
 Roe, David Allen, 15282A.  
 Ruehle, John Richard, 15276A.  
 Sales, Robert Newton, 15294A.  
 Sanders, James Burton, 15235A.  
 Sanderson, Edward Jennings, 15274A.  
 Sawyer, Clyde Lenox, Jr., 15238A.  
 Sawyer, Russell, 15272A.  
 Scheller, Donald Richard, 15318A.  
 Schroeder, Norman Clark, 15359A.  
 Scott, Samuel Woodward, 15264A.  
 Shafer, Jonathan Karl, 15298A.

Shelton, William Edgar, 15247A.  
 Simeone, Harold Martin, 15373A.  
 Smith, Chester Allen Arthur, 15230A.  
 Snoden, Charles Arthur, 15361A.  
 Spurrier, Paul McLellan, 15305A.  
 Stamm, Eugene Clarence, Jr., 15302A.  
 Stearns, Richard Charles, 15283A.  
 Steere, Lowell Beall, 15340A.  
 Stratton, Edward Earl, 15289A.  
 Stormo, Virgil MacArthur, 15287A.  
 Swindell, Charles William, 15240A.  
 × Taylor, Frank Raymond, 15377A.  
 Terry, Charles Millard, 15373A.  
 Thome, Joseph Eduard, 15371A.  
 Tipton, Jack Ray, 15336A.  
 Tomlinson, William Warren, 15236A.  
 Townsend, James Gordon, 15260A.  
 Vincenzi, August, 15252A.  
 Ward, Walter Earl, 15259A.  
 Webber, John Wallace, 15331A.  
 Wengel, Emil Joe, 15296A.  
 Wheelless, Ellis Joe, 1522A.  
 White, Herbert Richard, 15343A.  
 Willets, Ray Joseph, 15349A.  
 Wilson, Joseph Griswold, 15284A.  
 Workman, John Richard, 15253A.

#### To be first lieutenants

##### UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Buchanan, Robert Sylvester, 18292A.  
 Gross, Kenneth Eugene, 18289A.  
 Jackson, Charles Wilbur, 18284A.  
 League, Miles Richard, 18286A.  
 Matte, Joseph Zannet, 20615A.  
 Pulley, John Hubert, Jr., 18288A.  
 Rigsby, Cecil Harding, 18285A.  
 Tanner, Theodore John, 18287A.  
 Terrell, Harry Evans, Jr., 18291A.  
 Werbeck, Donald Louis, 18290A.

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended by Public Law 514, Eighty-first Congress. The officer whose name is preceded by the symbol (×) is subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

#### To be captains

##### AIR FORCE NURSES

Casey, Corinne, 21152W.  
 × Cigagna, Valarie Prima, 21083W.  
 Schadt, Sophia Marie, 21130W.  
 Visnovsky, Helen M., 21043W.

(NOTE.—All officers nominated for promotion to major, captain, and first lieutenant are eligible for permanent promotion during the month of February 1951. Dates of rank will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.)

#### IN THE NAVY

#### To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Harold M. Martin, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander.

#### To be rear admirals

The following-named line officers for temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Clarence L. C. Atkeson, William K. Mendenhall, Jr.	
John B. Pearson, Jr.	Harry D. Felt
Harry Sanders	John M. Will
William B. Ammon	Francis M. Hughes
Roland N. Smoot	Murr E. Arnold
James H. Thach, Jr.	John B. Moss
Frederick M. Trapnell	

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Robert F. Batchelder  
 Charles H. Gillilan

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 25, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Peter J. Rahill, of Catholic University, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, we thank Thee that among Thy whole earthly creation, to man alone Thou hast given an eternal soul, endowed with the wondrous faculties of intellect and will. For all mankind so blessed Thy loving mercy is entreated. Especially for our President and for the Members of this Congress do we today implore two heavenly graces. First, dear God, graciously grant to them clear understanding of the problems confronting our Nation. Then do Thou guide these men and women, our country's leaders, to choose the solutions most pleasing to Thy holy will. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 98) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the following named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House of Representatives: HAROLD C. HAGEN, Minnesota, and JAMES T. PATTERSON, Connecticut.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. STAGGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Monday next and also on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the majority leader what the legislative program will be for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there is no definite program for next week. As heretofore announced, on Thursday next at 10:30 a. m. there will be a meeting in the auditorium of the Library of Congress. This is not a part of the legislative program of the House but I repeat that announcement at this time for the information of the Members.

There is nothing for Monday or Tuesday. I can definitely say there will be no legislation considered on Monday.

One bill has been reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce relating to the monitoring of the radio, H. R. 1730, but whether or not that committee will seek and get a rule I am unable to state at this time.

So far as I know at this time, no bills will come up for consideration next week. If there are any, I will announce to the House just as soon as I possibly can. At the present time there is no definite program for next week. When extension of reciprocal trade is reported out of committee, it will be brought up as soon as possible; I hope, next week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I call the attention of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts to the fact that in accordance with past custom the Republicans would like to attend some Lincoln Day dinners in the early part of February, so that I hope the gentleman will adjust his legislative program with that thought in mind.

Mr. McCORMACK. Monday is the anniversary of the birthday of the late President McKinley and, of course, there are appropriate speeches made on that occasion each year. Tuesday is the anniversary of the birthday of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt and speeches will be made on that day. But that is not a part of the legislative program.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I hope the gentleman will arrange his program with the thought in mind that for several days before the birthday and for a few days afterward a good many Members of the House will be speaking at various Lincoln Day celebrations. The gentleman has always been very helpful in the past.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts knows that any program of the House around that time will be consistent with circumstances confronting the Republican Members in the making of speeches. When the party represented by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] was in control, the same consideration was given to us on Jackson Day and Jefferson Day. I will get together with the gentleman from Massachusetts and we will arrange a program that is satisfactory. Whatever program he wants we will make.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. No one could ask for more.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

## THE PEOPLE—YES AND NO

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the minority and majority leaders did not ask me anything about the program for next week, but I am always willing to be helpful. I will volunteer the statement that it is possible the majority cannot give us any idea about the program for next week because they have not heard from the United Nations yet and they do not know just what to do while waiting for a canned report from General Eisenhower. That is one thing that is causing trouble with the legislative program.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good speech I am about to make. I did not write it. I am just making it.

I notice the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] is present. He has not been making as many speeches in the well of the House about the situation in the Far East as he formerly did. I think he knows as much about that situation as any other Member of the House, and many have been hoping he would give us the benefit of his views.

This is the speech. Listen, please.

Today one question haunts the sleep of most of the people of the United States. It concerns our foreign policy.

Past, present, and future foreign policy has been debated on the radio and by the press. It has been the subject of addresses by such men as Dewey, Hoover, Dulles, Taft, and Stassen. Foreign policy and its effect on our way of life is the current topic of conversation in country stores, barrooms, barber shops, pool halls, homes, churches, and every place where men and women gather. Most every housewife, taxi driver, school teacher, and professional man has an opinion and does not hesitate to express it. At a school meeting we should get out of Korea, in the barber shop we should build a huge Navy, at the Elks, we should arm the Chinese Nationalists and hang onto Formosa, at the bridge table we should bomb the Manchurian industrial cities, at the courthouse we should withdraw from Europe. So it goes—different opinions from different people.

From these discussions, however, we get the impression that the people are more afraid of the mistakes that Truman and Acheson may make than they are of Communist aggression. A majority of the people are not stubborn, they realize that they are not in a position to make decisions and are willing to abide by the decisions of responsible, sincere, loyal, and intelligent men. In their present temper, however, they will not unite behind a foolish man stubbornly following a foolish policy. Universally, the people do not care where they have to fight, but they do not desire to fight needlessly or foolishly. The people are willing to make total sacrifice if necessary to preserve this country, but they have no desire to waste their lives and property in a vain attempt to create or preserve freedom for others who have not the inclination to do so.

The people also have no desire to make sacrifices to preserve the United Nations. They are opposed to the idea that our men must serve as United Nations policemen. The citizens of this Nation are not in the mood to be committed to a continuation of a foolish policy to save a political face or to satisfy a stubborn character.

The people recognize the Communist threat, they are mentally and morally prepared to meet this threat upon any battleground selected by a responsible, sincere, intelligent leader, devoted to his country.

The people are prepared to pay huge taxes to support an adequate military force. They are unwilling to pay huge taxes to promote socialism in this country.

Mr. Truman, as evidenced by his refusal to remove Mr. Acheson, by his re-



fusal to give authority to General MacArthur necessary to protect our Army in Korea, by his persistence in wasting billions of the taxpayers' money upon social schemes now termed defense measures, by his determination to sacrifice men in Europe regardless of Europe's determination to save itself, by his continued acceptance of UN policy to appease Red China, evidently has lost contact with the people.

The Presidential ear is not bent to the ground. The Presidential head is soaring in the clouds, while the Presidential mind is dreaming of the presidency of a united world.

It would be good for the country and for Mr. Truman, if he took a taxi, to the barber shop, stopped at the local Elks club for a drink, went to church, played a game of bridge and listened to what the people had to say.

If he did, he would return to his office a deflated but wiser man.

That is the end of what I say in a good speech. That speech was written by a young man way out in Michigan. I will say to my good friend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], that we have some good men in Michigan who want none of UN, who are weary of fighting other nations' wars, just as he has down in Mississippi, and they think as seriously about these matters as does he or his people. This young man who wrote this speech which I just made, served 2 years and 8 months in the armed services in the Second World War. When he enlisted, he had two boys, a wife, and a business. He enlisted. He was not subject to draft. When I asked him, "What are you enlisting for?" he said, "I do not want my boys to fight the Japs some day in the future; I want to keep them out of war." Now, what he is worrying about is that notwithstanding his service, and he was lucky, those boys are almost certain to go. He just realizes, as do a few million others, that all of his service and that all those who served to a much greater extent did not do anyone any lasting good. That neither World War I nor World War II ended war or gave freedom to all.

Most seriously, my colleagues, is it not about time that somebody here in the House who is competent, who knows about war like my friend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd], like the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SMITH], who served in the other war and who had command of a part of an army, who knows Germany like most of us know our own back yards—and we have another gentleman, an officer, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX], who served with the Marines—is it not about time that they—and I am told there are some 225 or 250 veterans in this House who have some first-hand information who know more about the actual fighting than the rest of us, should tell us and tell the country how to get us out of this war before a million of our men are killed. This war will wreck us, there is no question about that. You all know that as well or far better than I do. It is one thing to fight for your country—it is something else to be used as a cat's paw by another nation to fall sucker into Stalin's trap.

Oh, yes, I almost forgot that speech was just an editorial written by Leo W. Hoffman, printed in the Allegan Gazette, my home-town paper.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Tuesday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

#### SOURCE FROM WHICH FUNDS CAN BE OBTAINED TO BALANCE THE BUDGET—GOVERNMENT FINANCES

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the subject I am going to discuss is how we can meet the budget which the President of the United States submitted to the Congress only a few days ago. I am going to deal with the question of average wage levels, average price levels, national income, and credit extension, as they relate to this subject. You may be able to get a few drops of comfort out of what I have to say, because I am not selling the United States short yet.

I shall give credit to Mr. Carl Wilken, who has spent many years here on the Hill analyzing economic conditions and forces and consequences, who has collaborated with me in this statement, and I have worked with him.

I have also a brief statistical summary presented by Paul Peters, who has also been here on the Hill for a number of years.

The basis of all the remarks I am going to make is found in the economic report recently submitted by the President of the United States through the Advisory Council headed by Mr. Keyserling.

In the field of production of goods, whether primary, basic raw materials or manufactured materials, we have such a thing as wage levels. As hourly wages advance, cost goes up, as a general rule.

Only a few years ago in 1929 the hourly wage was 56.6 cents per hour. In December, in the last quarter of 1950, it was \$1.51 per hour, or an increase of approximately 167 or 168 percent in the hourly wage between 1929 and 1950.

That means the selling price had to increase if you were to stay on a profitable basis so that the articles could be produced and the income be taxed and the tax money put into the tax box. In 1929 with the average wage figure which I gave and with that big increase, we have reason to assume that these costs are higher now and that the higher prices are justified. In 1929 the prices of all commodities, the BLS wholesale index, was 95.3 as related to 100 for 1926. In December 1950 the wholesale price index was 174.5, or an increase of ap-

proximately 100 percent. The comparison of the hourly wage as to the price level in 1929 and December 1950 shows an increase of 33½ percent of buying power of an hour of work and that is really what counts—what can you buy with the work that you perform?

Thus the increase in our standard of living includes the increase in the per hour production.

Let us take our national income for a moment. In 1939 the national income was \$72,500,000,000. In 1948 it had jumped to \$223,500,000,000. In the last quarter of 1950 it was knocking along at the rate of \$254,000,000,000 per annum. I am talking about the national income in those periods.

As to the price level in 1939, it was 77 percent of what it was in 1926; in 1948 it was 165 percent of what it was in 1926, and in the last quarter of 1950 it was 174 percent of what it was in 1926.

What was your labor income? In 1939 it was \$45,700,000,000. In 1948 it was \$134,000,000,000, and in the last quarter of 1950 it was knocking along at \$155,900,000,000 for wages for people who were on the payrolls.

If you want to break this thing down over the period of years you will find that total wage income runs about 62 percent of the national income. There is a constant there that you can depend on and that is 62 percent of the national income.

How many workers do we have today? Well, we are talking about having 65,000,000 people on the payroll within a few months. If this war situation develops as we are now planning in every way that I know of that we can plan, we should have around 67,000,000 payrollees. If we keep the price level the way it is at the present time those 65 to 67 million payrollees, if they will work, with our present productive facilities, should turn out a volume of goods, which multiplied by this present price level will give us a national income of not less than \$360,000,000,000 a year—let us say in 1952.

Take 60 percent of that and see what your wage income is—your spendable income of the workers. That gets into big money in any man's language. Take 16 percent of that \$360,000,000,000 for Federal taxes and see how many dollars you put into the tax box as compared with 17 percent at the rate you paid last year, and figure out if you can how much the additional contribution to the tax box is hurting you, if it is hurting you at all.

In other words, if you want to buy an automobile or a washing machine or a sewing machine and do not have the money to pay for it, and you do not want to go in debt, then get out somewhere and go to work and earn the money to buy a washing machine or automobile or sewing machine. If you want a \$72,000,000 budget in peacetime, and you do not have the money to pay for it, get out and go to work and make the money, by producing the goods and selling those goods, and putting the money in the tax box that you need to cover the budget. That is the sound way to do it. Do not sit around on your soft seats and pray to God to pay the bills for you.

So my flat, cold-blooded proposition is, that if we want to, we can meet the \$72,000,000,000 budget which has been submitted to us and cover every dollar of it into the tax box from the production that we can produce with our present employees and our present productive facilities if we will get on the job and produce the goods.

Do not understand me at all to be advocating a \$72,000,000,000 budget, if that \$72,000,000,000 budget is even \$100,000 more than it should be. I do not have any patience or any respect for anyone who wastes things economically. I do not care who he is or who she is, especially in a crisis such as we now face.

I am going back to some more figures. Of the 60,000,000 civilian employees which we have had in recent months there are about 10,000,000 engaged in business operations. About 50,000,000 of them receive their income in the form of pay checks. Those pay checks in turn represent their share of the income generated by the economic cycle of production, processing, and distribution in the United States. In 1939 you had a national income of \$72,500,000,000. The last quarter of 1950 was on the basis of 254 billion, as I previously pointed out, which was an increase of 251 percent. The increase in the wage income was 241 percent in 1950 as compared with 1939. The increase in retail sales volume was 212 percent. National income, wage income, and retail sales—you cannot separate them. They go together, because if people earn money they are going to spend it. You have certain constants all the way through this picture, which tell you whether or not your economy is balanced over a period of 50 or 75 or 100 years in the United States.

The people who constantly yell about prices being too high are not considering and weighing all those things which are related to prices. If you are going to pay a man \$15 an hour wages, you can bet your life that whatever he produces is going to cost a lot of money. If you do not want high costs and a high selling price, then cut wages down to 50 cents an hour and you can have your low price—if low price is all you want. But I am not advocating you do this.

The increase in total wage as compared to the increase in total sales volume indicates clearly that the worker was in a better ratio to price levels in 1950 than he was in 1929.

The total payroll brought approximately 13 percent more goods for him to consume, and he is crying his eyes out about prices being so high, but he does not say anything in the world about the fact that his wages are much higher and his standard of living up considerably.

Last fall I think every Member of this House heard a great deal said about restricting credit—taking the credit privilege away from the people. Well, whose idea was that? Some fellow promoted the idea that if you wanted to prevent inflation you should cut down credit extension. So the order was issued to cut out credit. Let us see what that did.

In 1929 you had a certain ratio of credit to the total volume of retail sales. You had a certain ratio of credit to total wage income. You had a certain ratio of

credit to total national income. Take 1919, take 1928, take 1939, and check those figures closely. You will find that the \$20,000,000,000 of consumer credit in the last quarter of 1950 was not excessive as compared with previous years' operations. Yet many people contended, and millions believed, that if they would restrict credit, price inflation would be prevented.

Here are some details:

In 1939 all consumer credit totaled \$7,000,000,000 as compared to \$20,000,000,000 in December 1950. This is an increase of 185 percent. Credit extension in 1939 when compared to total retail sales of \$42,000,000,000 in 1939 was \$1 of credit for \$6 of sales. In 1948 total retail sales were \$123,800,000,000 with a credit extension of \$14,300,000,000 or \$1 of credit extension for each \$8.40 of retail sales. In fourth quarter 1950 total retail sales were running at a level of \$136,000,000,000 and consumer credit extension averaged \$19,600,000,000 or \$1 of credit for each \$7 of sales.

In other words credit extension in 1948 and 1949 and 1950 was less in ratio to sales than in 1939 when we had a depression. This is a natural corollary as a state of prosperity or full employment finds individuals better able to pay cash for many items.

Stated in another way credit extension has not been excessive and was not the cause for rising prices. The real facts are that the increase in hourly wages, commodity prices, and so forth, increased the use of credit in ratio to dollar volume of sales.

The same illustration can be applied to inventories and bank deposits and currency.

In 1939, total deposits and currency totaled \$68,300,000,000 as compared to \$183,500,000,000 in 1950 (December). This is an increase of approximately 170 percent as compared to an increase of 223 percent in retail sales volume. The money supply in 1939 ratioed lower to total volume of business than in 1939.

In the case of inventories, total inventories in 1939 were \$20,100,000,000 as compared to \$59,700,000,000 in November 1950. This increase of 197 percent in inventories can be compared to the increase in retail sales amounting to 223 percent.

Summed up, our business units were doing a larger volume of sales in 1950 on a lower extension of credit and with a comparatively smaller inventory than in 1939. Credit was restricted, drastically restricted, since last summer; and every day since that restriction took place your prices have gone up, up, up; and wage increases have occurred; wages have gone up, national income has gone up, volume of retail sales has gone up; and the restriction of credit did not amount to anything so far as keeping prices down. During the campaign the story was, "We are going to restrict credit and thereby prevent inflation." You who so advocated sold a bill of goods to the people of this country. The national income increased from \$214,000,000,000 in the last quarter of 1949 to \$254,000,000,000 in the last quarter of 1950. Here you see an increase in the national income of \$40,000,000,000 in 12 months.

The factors that result in an increase in income operate to affect an increase in the cost of unit production, in the unit sales price. With an economy that moves up and down as swiftly as ours any appropriations made by Congress are merely wild guesses, just as I stated on the floor a few days ago when we had under consideration the big air carrier bill; the question arose about whether or not the program could be built for \$2,000,000,000. I said at that time that you could not tell but what it might take \$20,000,000,000 to build it within 3½ years because we could not tell what the price level would be or what the wage level would be. So I said we were just making guesses on it and advocated renegotiated contracts. I am not complaining about the fact that we make guesses; I am simply pointing out the fact that we do make guesses; these appropriations are merely guesses. We come in later and ask for other appropriations to complete the projects, but the subsequent appropriations can be nothing but guesses either. Unless prices are stabilized appropriations may effectuate only 70, 50, or 40 percent of what we thought they would at the time the appropriation was made.

In like manner, any taxes which may be assessed, that is, through the provisions of a tax bill here, is simply a guess. For example, corporate taxes in 1949 were \$10,600,000,000; in 1950 they were \$18,300,000,000. This increase of \$7,700,000,000 in Federal revenue was not expected when the 1950 and 1951 budget was prepared. Because of this increase in current tax income we just about balanced the cash outgo through the budget operations.

Unless certain steps are taken to stabilize prices—here is where we get into it—to stabilize prices our whole financial structure will continue to be one of confusion because of this instability. Congress, on the other hand, will be completely at sea as to what would constitute a proper tax approach or a proper appropriations approach. It might be well to give a brief analysis of the dynamic economy we have simply to illustrate just what we have. First, let us consider our efficiency ratio. I had three letters on this subject this morning in my mail from very, very prominent people in my district; one is a very prominent young lawyer. Our fiscal ratio is such that each \$1 of gross farm income turns over about seven times, supporting \$7 of our national income. But this ratio can be altered by a downward swing in national income such as in 1929 to 1932, and from 1948 to 1949, and the upward swing of the transition from 1949 to 1950. In 1932 there was the same farm production as you had in 1929, but it produced \$7,000,000,000 less of gross farm income. The result in national income was a drop of, roughly, \$45,000,000,000 in 1933. The low point in our national income usually comes about 6 months after the low in gross farm income. One of my writers this morning asks: "When are you fellows in Congress going to cut out these supports and subsidies for the farmer?" I write back and tell them: "If you will eliminate collective bargaining, the



Wagner Act and all that came out of that act, and the Taft-Hartley Act and all that came out of it, put labor back on the open-market basis where there is no collective bargaining whatsoever, no support by the Congress, no support by the machinery of the Federal Government, turn it loose, let it work its own way, the farmer can go along just as well as labor." But if you are going to do all of these things that the organized labor laws give to those who work in industry, and provided you want to sell those goods from the factories, the transportation lines of all kinds, and other activities, if you want to sell those things you can bet your bottom dollar the farmer has got to have his piece of cake in the form of a fair wage so as to have enough income to buy that which is produced in the factories under collective bargaining. You cannot get around that—if you think you can, go ahead and cut the farm income back to \$20,000,000,000 instead of \$35,000,000,000. Go ahead and try that just once. If you do, you will be the sickest group of economic planners that you ever saw.

On the other hand, if you want a high, strong national income, full employment, full payrolls, pay the primary producer a comparable wage for his production so that he can buy the goods of industry. Pay him parity. That is all that is necessary. That is the only answer I have. If you have a better one I wish you would submit it here some time. I would like to have it, and the country needs the truth.

Now, farm prices dropped, and let us consider recent years; in 1948 farm prices dropped. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] knows they dropped approximately \$3,000,000,000 in gross farm income, which results in a loss of about \$20,000,000,000 of national income. If you have a drop in national income what happens to the wage income? It is going to drop also. What is going to happen to retail sales volume? It is going to drop. What is going to happen to the tax dollar stream to the Federal Treasury? It is going to drop because taxable income drops.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad to have the gentleman's comment on farm income. A few weeks ago the Secretary of Agriculture announced that the farm income for 1951 would be increased by 10 percent, but he failed to say that the things that the farmer had to buy increased over 20 percent.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. So the farmer is worse off by a 10-percent increase than he was before they started in with this new scheme.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think so.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman has referred to the turn-over as a result of agricultural production as being 7 to 1. It is quite apparent that the administration is going to put on price control, particularly on meat and other commodities. The gentleman knows this will retard production, that a great deal of these scarce commodities,

not only in food but in other lines, will pass into the black market; and the money received in the black market will be hidden and not really pass through normal channels of trade. What does the gentleman think of that kind of an economy?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think it is about as destructive to the so-called poor man as anything could be. I have written to people in my district in the last 2 or 3 days to the effect that within 60 to 90 days after controls are put on meat and meat products the products will begin to move into the black markets, meat will become much scarcer and the price at the retail butcher's counter will be higher than at the present time because these products will be moving out through black-market channels.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And eventually, I may say, meat will pass into the black market so that the people who want to abide by the laws and the regulations will not be able to get it through normal channels of trade.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think that is what is going to happen.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Are we admitting here that we have not the courage to deal with the black-market situation?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would not say that. I simply say that what the Congress did a few months ago, back last summer, was to put into operation a program which when it is effectuated will promote the black market. So whether we have courage or not, we took that action.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman knows, and I know, from experience that we have, particularly in meat, a Nation-wide black-market ring ready to take over the merchandising of meat through black-market channels; in fact, the black marketeers are among those people who are urging this price control, the control system, over meat and other products.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct. Here is a check that was given to me this morning by a farmer who lives within about 30 minutes drive of this building. That check is for \$325. What do you suppose it paid for? It paid for a little steer I sold to him this morning. I helped him load it on the truck before I came to the office—\$325 for one little critter in the form of a beef animal. I sold him some more of these steers at the same price previous to this. This was his third order. When you sell a piece of meat on the hoof at a price like that—and I did not send for this man to come and buy this steer; he made repeated trips there to buy them—that steer will be worth more money next week than it was today, and this \$325 will buy less in the market next week than it does today. So, why would I want the check? Why does he want the steer? If you are going to pay that kind of a price for meat on the hoof you are going to pay a dollar a pound for beefsteak at the retail store; make no mistake about that. But this comes out of the high wages, the high income, the high retail sales value, and the

high prices, and so on, down the line. There is nothing unnatural. This will pay the farmer who raised it about 35 cents an hour wage. The man who eats the beefsteak gets \$1.56 an hour average wage. Is there anything wrong with that? Figure it out.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Contributing to that, such things as they have done recently, increasing the price per quart of milk, there was nothing back of that at all. By their own admission, there is nothing back of that at all; no wage increase, no added service performed by the milk distributors in the Washington milkshed. Yet, they increased the price.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is administered prices.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GWINN. I wanted to be perfectly sure. I was a bit surprised a while ago when the gentleman referred to the price going up unless, as I understood him originally, price control, or management of prices was put into effect. Does the gentleman favor such a program?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let me make that clear. I said you have to stabilize these prices. Who is going to stabilize the wage? If every few days organized labor is going to come in and demand and receive, with the full approval of the Government of the United States, another 5, 10, 15 or 20 cents an hour wage increase, is there any stability in that? Suppose wages do not go up any more, would there be any reason to increase prices? Of course not. Suppose we put wages to \$25 an hour all the way across the board, where do you think prices are going to go? Now, as long as you keep raising these wages you are going to keep increasing your costs and the prices are going to continue upward. Who handles the wage increases? Who can stop wage increases? That is No. 1. But listen to your radio reports this morning. Is your wage control to come out first? No; that will be the last thing. You see what I mean? So I voted against the price-control bill. I have never supported price control, but I am discussing now the question of price levels, the question of having a gross national income, a wage income, which can be taxed in such a manner so as to pay the legitimate expenditures of this Government, trying to show where we can get this money to meet this budget.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the gentleman knows, will he advise the House what the weight of that steer was that he sold this morning for \$325?

Mr. CRAWFORD. It weighed, I would guess, about between 1,000 and 1,100 pounds. I never weigh them. I say, "I want so much for this steer. If you want to buy it, all right."

Mr. McMULLEN. What was the price per pound?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let us say around 32 or 33 cents a pound.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not intend to inject myself into the gentleman's speech, but I am wondering if the gentleman will reconcile that \$325 check he received this morning with the fact that there is no control and his statement that he is against control. I am just trying to reconcile the two statements of my friend.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The steer brings \$325, or let us say 32.5 cents a pound, because of the costs involved in the feeding, the machinery that is used on the farm to produce the feed, farm labor, and so forth. If those costs advance, the price of that steer is going to advance. If the wages for making these cattle advance, the price of steers is going to advance in another year or two. If the beef population drops, the price of beef will advance even without an advance in the price of these other products. We have had the idea that we could push this so-called spendable proposition to the top of the mountain. As long as we are doing that, we are going to keep pushing these prices up.

There is no big income in the sale of the steer, because if there was there would be a lot more steers grown. The farmers in my district, and there are letters which came in my mail this morning which I can show to the gentleman from Massachusetts that show this, are switching away from the beef animal. We are going into hogs. Why are we doing that? We cannot grow the beef animals so quickly, there is a bigger risk in the market, a lot more labor is involved, and we can take 12 bushels of corn and grow so many pounds of meat in the form of a pig which would sell at such and such a price and which would be a better price than the \$325 steer.

Mr. McCORMACK. I can understand those factors entering into it, but the gentleman was apparently saying that he should never have got this \$325 price for the steer he sold.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. Those factors exist. How are you going to stop this from going on unless you have some kind of controls?

Mr. CRAWFORD. We either stop it voluntarily—

Mr. McCORMACK. Which the gentleman knows cannot be done.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not admit that at all. We either stop it voluntarily or we subject ourselves to a controlled-black-market, decrease-production economy; and I prefer the first.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am just trying to form in my own mind how the gentleman reconciles the basic position he takes in his speech, that he is against controls, with his further statement that he should never have received \$325 for the steer he sold this morning. We know the factors that enter into that, wages, cost of feed, and other things; true. As they increase, naturally the

prices are going to increase. The gentleman complains against receiving \$325 for that steer. He would object to receiving \$400 a month later or 2 months later, or any higher amount. How does the gentleman reconcile his statements, that is what I should like to know. What can we do? Please understand, I am seeking information.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. This Nation has existed for 175 years. Roughly, most of the time we operated this country on an open-market basis, where the law of supply and demand governed, where you would go into the market and pay what you thought you ought to pay, and if the other fellow did not want to sell he did not have to sell. We got along pretty well that way. Now we have jimmied our whole economy up to where we think we can just walk out and, any time we please, say "If you don't give me 20 cents an hour increase in wages I am going to strike and stop production."

We have followed that course for several years here, and we have come around to the present moment. I think that course is very false. I do not think we should follow it. I do not think beef should sell at a dollar and a quarter a pound at the retail store and I do not think the steer should sell for \$325, but it does, by reason of what went before. It is a consequence of the cause.

I am just against that kind of thing.

Mr. McCORMACK. What would the gentleman do?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would stop increasing these costs.

Mr. McCORMACK. How would the gentleman do it?

Mr. CRAWFORD. By stopping the increasing of the wage structures.

Mr. McCORMACK. How would the gentleman do that?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Well, when the people have no leadership they perish. That applies to payrollees as well as other people.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is no answer to the problem.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Well, if there is a man down the street murdering another man, do you say, "What would you suggest as a substitute?" I am suggesting to stop the murder.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, the gentleman's answer to my question is to grind down the worker.

Mr. CRAWFORD. No. Now, I said no such thing, and you are not going to put words in my mouth. I said no such thing.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course it is true that the gentleman did not use that exact language.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further.

I was afraid that you would get off on that kind of track. I tried to teach you in the first place that if you increase

the cost, the prices are going to go up. If you stop increasing the cost it would stabilize the price level. The administration ought to know that controls do not work. They have found that out. When they tell the people to sell goods cheaper and then raise the wages, that is all poppycock and phony and fallacious economic doctrine and it is no good at all.

I want to make this additional point before my time expires. On the basis of full employment on a 40-hour week we can in 1952, if we want to do so, produce \$360,000,000,000 of national income here in the United States on today's price level. Do we want to do it? My guess is no, because they do not want to work 40 hours a week full time.

They do not want to work 48 hours a week. But with \$375,000,000,000, and on the basis of today's price level, with that national income you can raise your \$72,000,000,000 and balance this budget and hurt nobody any more than they were hurt last year in paying their taxes. That is the point I want to make. So I repeat what I said on the floor the other day. I am in favor of expanding the work week to 48 hours, with no further wage increases, with time and a half not paid for the extra 8 hours over the 40 hours. Do I make my position clear on that? That would give you more goods for the people. It will effectuate a lower cost price so that your selling price can come down in proportion and it will take care of the total gross income of the Nation, the total spendable income to the payrollees, and give you a sound economy and a balanced budget for the first time, of any consequence, in 20 years. I think it is about time we got down to brass tacks and looked the mule right straight in the face, and admit that we are willing to pay this party we are trying to put on. If you do not want to do that, then go ahead and take the economic consequences. Try to go ahead with deficit financing again. Try to push your debt from \$260,000,000,000 to \$360,000,000,000. Suffer from inflation. Put on new price controls. Surrender your economic life in this country to some dictator sitting here in a central office. Establish a local commissar. Extend your one-party system. Kiss your good old Government of the United States good-by. So far as I am concerned, I am against any such proposal.

#### PRICE CEILINGS

The record and common sense should dictate the price policy. We know that we have a lot of submarginal production at all times because of unequal production from our natural resources. We have good farm land and poor farm land. We have rich ore bodies and other ore bodies of lower grade. Care, therefore, should be taken in any program of price ceilings to avoid too great a rigidity of prices.

A careful study of our American system would indicate that a price floor 90 percent of parity as assurance to the producer of basic commodities and a ceiling of 110 percent as a protection for the consumer would bring about a price structure averaging about 100 percent of parity while at the same time permitting



the flexibility of price to make adjustments in both production and consumption of goods in surplus and scarce supply.

Wages should be stabilized in ratio to the commodity price level and in ratio to per man production. Finally the business operations should be permitted an operating margin comparable to normal margins existing when our economy was operating on a full production basis.

Under a system of tariffs we have always had a support price in proportion to the amount of the tariff and in turn the tariff has acted as a ceiling, permitting competitive imports in case of shortages.

If we are to have collective bargaining for industry and with a program of price stabilization the Nation should not have any serious inflation or depressions.

On a basis of full employment and a 40-hour week our economy could generate \$360,000,000,000 of national income at price levels which now prevail. Any further increase which might be gained through a longer work week would add national income in proportion. With a system of taxes in ratio to Federal expenditures we could operate on a pay-as-you-go basis.

For example, during World War II the American public after their expenditures for goods and services in the 3-year period 1943-45, had \$200,000,000,000 left over. After paying \$55,000,000,000 of personal income taxes they still had remaining \$144,000,000,000. Failure to tax this income added to the inflationary pressure in the amount of the increase in our national debt. In peacetime consumers tax their income for the purchase of a car or other form of durable goods. If the same tax was levied against our personal income to pay for such goods diverted for war purposes, we could pay as we go. Fundamentally goods produced for peace or war at a proper price level will generate the national income to consume them.

I have pointed out that the national income is the buying power in whatever amount created from production times the prevailing price level. Below are the comparisons of the principal factors in national income for 1939, 1942, and 1950. The year 1942 has been used, as 1939 is not a fair comparison because of the fact that we had 9,000,000 workers unemployed and our economy was not operating efficiently, or with a volume to warrant proper comparisons of profit for business units.

National income

Year	National income	Percentage increase to 1950
	Billions	
1939.....	\$72.5	225.7
1942.....	137.1	72.2
1950.....	236.2	

Hourly wages, all industry

Year	Wages, per hour	Increase
1939.....	63.3 cents..	From 1939 to 1950, 130.6 percent.
1942.....	85.3 cents..	From 1942 to 1950, 71.4 percent.
1950.....	\$1.46.....	

NOTE.—Similarity of percentage of increase of hourly wages and national income increase from 1942 to 1950.

Total wage income, less social-security payments

Year	Income	Percent increase to 1950	Percent of national income
	Billions		
1939.....	\$45.7	217.7	63.0
1942.....	81.4	66.0	59.3
1950.....	145.2		61.5

Retail sales

Year	Retail sales (billions)	Percent of 1950	Percent of national income
1939.....	\$42.0	212.3	58.0
1942.....	60.0	118.6	43.8
1950.....	131.2		55.5

NOTE.—Low percentage of retail sales to national income in 1942 shows the lag between rising prices for raw materials and wages and their transition into higher prices at retail.

Wholesale commodity price level  
[BLS, 1926=100]

Year	Price level	Percent increase to 1950
1939.....	77.1	109.3
1942.....	98.8	63.3
1950.....	161.4	

Consumer credit

Year	Billions	Percent of national income
1939.....	\$7.0	9.66
1942.....	5.7	4.15
1950.....	20.0	8.46

Bank deposits and currency

Year	Billions	Percent of national income
1939.....	\$68.3	94.2
1950.....	183.5	77.6

#### STOP FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO OTHER NATIONS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LYLE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, to those of us who have consistently supported various programs for economic and military aid to friendly nations, some of their actions and attitudes come as a considerable shock.

With some justification our colleagues who have opposed these programs say to us, "You see, these nations which we have helped to get on their feet cannot be relied on to stand with us in a struggle to maintain ideals, if their own economic or political interests are in any way adversely affected."

The time has come, if it has not passed, for our Government to serve notice on those who seek our financial assistance that we have reached the stop sign at the end of the one-way street. The determination of our future course is now largely in their hands. It is they who must remove the stop sign and open the

street up to traffic flowing in both directions. We have invited them, we have urged them to meet us part way and to travel together toward our goal to repel and discourage naked aggression and to achieve a solid and just foundation for a peaceful world. If they prefer to give priority to the advancement of their own nationalistic or economic aims and shut the door in our faces, regrettable as that may be from every point of view, let them not complain if we match this attitude of ultrasolationism on their part with a hard-boiled realization that, when the chips are down, we must depend primarily upon United States industrial might, the courage and resourcefulness of United States fighting men, and the determination of United States citizenry to remain free. Let us hope and pray that a prompt and basic change in the policy of our sister nations may take place. The outlook at the moment is bleak.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SHAFER (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), on account of illness in his family.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a poem on the American flag.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, and in one to include a letter and an article from the Reader's Digest and in the other the opinions of the National Opinion Research Center.

Mr. MORANO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter he wrote to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. DOUGHTON.

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. O'HARA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. McMULLEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. POULSON and Mr. JAVITS asked and were given permission to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include two newspaper editorials.

Mr. GWINN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KENNEDY (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include newspaper editorials.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 29, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

122. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting certain surveys and a part of a report, pursuant to section 4 of the act of September 25, 1950 (Public Law 837, 81st Cong.), pertaining to the Bureau of Mines, the Geological Survey, and the National Park Service, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Florida: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 1730. A bill to amend section 4 (g) of the Communications Act of 1934 to permit the Federal Communications Commission to make expenditures for land for radio monitoring stations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 13). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 2081. A bill to provide for a Christopher Columbus Memorial Arbor in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 2082. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 2083. A bill to designate the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier of the American Revolution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 2084. A bill relating to the treatment of powers of appointment for estate and gift tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 2085. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 2086. A bill to adjust the salaries of postmasters and supervisors of the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 2087. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for widows of certain former Federal employees who had rendered 30 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H. R. 2088. A bill to appropriate funds for flood protection of Barboursville, Ky.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 2089. A bill to appropriate funds for flood protection of Pineville, Ky.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 2090. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 2091. A bill to guarantee all existing industrial centers in the United States a fair share of defense industry; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 2092. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2093. A bill to provide for home rule and reorganization in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2094. A bill to amend the act of August 7, 1946, so as to authorize the making of grants for hospital facilities, to provide a basis for repayment to the Government by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McMULLEN:

H. R. 2095. A bill granting to persons who serve in the Armed Forces during the present hostilities, and to their dependents, all the rights, benefits, and privileges granted to veterans of World War II and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 2096. A bill to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2097. A bill to amend the act of June 30, 1950 (Public Law 597, 81st Cong.), relating to the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2098. A bill to provide for the enlistment of aliens in the Army of the United States for service outside the continental United States in a Volunteer Freedom Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 2099. A bill to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of fur products and furs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'HARA (by request):

H. R. 2100. A bill to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act to provide for judicial review; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 2101. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 2102. A bill to provide for local taxation of real estate and improvements thereon owned by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2103. A bill to provide for home rule and reorganization in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. R. 2104. A bill to provide for home rule and reorganization in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 2105. A bill to include the fees for issuing money orders as a part of the gross postal receipts of post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YATES:

H. J. Res. 183. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim February 3 of each year as Dorchester Day for the observance and commemoration of the deaths and the heroic act of Chaplains Clark V. Poling, George L. Fox, John Patrick Washington, and Alexander D. Goode; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution inviting the democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates to a federal convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. Res. 99. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Agriculture to make studies and investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. Res. 100. Resolution to amend certain clauses of rules X, XI, and XII of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, relating to the Schick General Hospital, Clinton, Iowa; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 2106. A bill for the relief of Marianne Eise Banck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 2107. A bill for the relief of Edward M. Chapman, Roland P. Davis, and the Fidelity & Casualty Co., of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 2108. A bill for the relief of Constantin Michel Zampikos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGUIRE:

H. R. 2109. A bill for the relief of Arthur Cleveland Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 2110. A bill for the relief of Continental Insurance Co., Federal Insurance Co., and National Fire Insurance Co., of Hartford, Conn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 2111. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Suga Umezaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 2112. A bill to provide for the renewal of patent No. 2,038,584, issued April 28, 1936, relating to food containers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (by request):

H. R. 2113. A bill for the relief of Yee Kee Lam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2114. A bill for the relief of Joe Lee (also known as Lee Jow); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 2115. A bill for the relief of Elmer E. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2116. A bill for the relief of Cecil D. Rose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 2117. A bill for the relief of Rica, Lucy, and Salomon Breger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

## COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

JANUARY 1, 1951.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person em-



played by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Joseph O. Parker.....	Attorney (P).....	\$5,422.98
John Heimburger.....	Research specialist (P).....	5,422.98
Altavene Clark.....	Executive officer (P).....	3,615.32
Mabel Downey.....	Clerk (C).....	5,422.98
Alice Baker.....	Staff assistant (C).....	2,627.52
Lydia Vacin.....	do.....	2,627.52
Lorraine Adamson.....	do.....	2,207.52
Betty Prezioso.....	do.....	2,015.58
Leo R. Mazingo (July).....	Messenger.....	191.53

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$50,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....15,607.31

Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950.....4,646.69

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1949 to Dec. 31, 1950.....20,254.00

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1950.....29,746.00

HAROLD D. COOLEY,  
Chairman.

#### COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

JANUARY 15, 1951.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George Y. Harvey.....	The clerk.....	\$5,422.98
Kenneth Sprinkle.....	The assistant clerk.....	5,422.98
William A. Duvall.....	Second assistant clerk.....	5,242.50
Corhal D. Orescan.....	Assistant clerk.....	5,242.50
Robert E. Lambert.....	do.....	5,242.50
Arthur Orr.....	do.....	4,896.90
Paul M. Wilson.....	do.....	4,896.90
Ross P. Pope.....	do.....	4,753.60
Robert P. Williams.....	do.....	4,689.48
Claude E. Hobbs, Jr.....	do.....	4,436.04
Jay B. Howe.....	do.....	4,436.04
Frank Sanders.....	do.....	3,859.98
Lawrence C. Miller.....	Junior assistant clerk.....	2,786.88
G. Homer Skarin.....	do.....	2,521.34
Earl C. Silsby.....	do.....	2,448.92
Melvin E. Lefever.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	1,990.26
Robert W. Thompson.....	do.....	1,990.26
James A. Eastop.....	do.....	718.70
Robert M. Lewis.....	Messenger.....	1,686.12
Frank B. Avery, Jr.....	Page.....	1,555.74
John Pugh.....	Consultant.....	612.88
E. L. Eekloff.....	Clerk to the majority.....	4,205.64
Robert E. Lee.....	Clerk to the minority.....	5,422.98
Lawrence A. DiCenzo.....	Clerk-stenographer to ranking minority member.....	1,990.26
Julia M. Elliott.....	Clerk-stenographer to subcommittee chairman.....	1,990.26
Vivian V. Martin.....	do.....	1,990.26
Eula D. Riggsby.....	do.....	1,990.26
Marion B. Lacey.....	do.....	1,990.26
Josephine E. Frick.....	do.....	995.13
Alice C. Keefe.....	do.....	1,990.26
William J. Neary.....	do.....	1,990.26
N. C. Barrett.....	do.....	1,658.55
Michael J. McGrath.....	do.....	1,990.26
Genéva Nichols.....	do.....	995.13
Norjean Ray.....	do.....	331.71

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$232,000.00

Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950.....104,389.72

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1950.....127,610.28

CLARENCE CANNON,  
Chairman.

#### COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS (INVESTIGATIVE STAFF)

JANUARY 15, 1951.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
James J. Maloney.....	Chief investigator.....	\$4,274.76
Frederic D. Vechev.....	Investigator.....	4,179.08
Hazel N. Ward.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	1,809.24
Anna R. Murabito.....	do.....	1,686.12

#### REIMBURSEMENTS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Atomic Energy Commission:		
Albert P. Pollman.....	Investigator.....	2,725.80
Ned Williams.....	do.....	2,250.00
Civil Service Commission:		
John E. Moore.....	do.....	3,786.15
George R. Boss.....	do.....	2,798.49
Federal Bureau of Investigation:		
James E. Nugent.....	do.....	3,996.64
Robert E. Rightmyer.....	do.....	3,496.66
Paul G. Travers.....	do.....	2,238.47
Interstate Commerce Commission: Alexis P. Bukovsky.....	do.....	1,496.14
Federal Power Commission:		
Oscar A. Arnold.....	do.....	3,492.30
Arne H. Ronka.....	do.....	3,461.50
Federal Security Agency:		
Charles M. Erisman.....	do.....	2,100.00
C. Erwin Rice.....	do.....	3,702.11
Department of Labor: Charles E. Hutsler.....	do.....	1,349.99
Department of the Navy:		
Donald M. Patterson.....	do.....	3,465.28
Paul G. Ross.....	do.....	3,088.96
Securities and Exchange Commission:		
Michael J. Ladapadula.....	do.....	1,847.32
Joseph Bernstein.....	do.....	1,829.21
The Panama Canal:		
Edwin M. McGinnis.....	do.....	3,118.20
Augustus C. Medinger.....	do.....	3,461.55
Nelson E. Wise.....	do.....	2,561.20
Veterans' Administration:		
Stephen J. Grillo.....	do.....	2,784.00
Joe M. Hansman.....	do.....	2,855.38
Federal Bureau of Investigation:		
Maurice A. Hickey.....	Temporary clerical assistant.....	187.99
Frederick C. Fehl.....	do.....	490.79
Federal Security Agency: Irene Bialek.....	do.....	97.24
Treasury Department:		
Frances E. Donovan.....	do.....	141.12
Anna Mae Fleishell.....	do.....	125.44

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$150,000.00

Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950.....96,083.15

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1950.....53,916.85

Payment of bills rendered for prior fiscal period.....3,148.77

CLARENCE CANNON,  
Chairman.

#### ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

DECEMBER 31, 1950.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of

the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert H. Harper.....	Chief clerk.....	\$5,422.98
William Wingate.....	Assistant clerk.....	2,142.36
John R. Blandford.....	Professional staff member.....	5,422.98
Charles F. Ducander.....	do.....	5,422.98
Bryce N. Harlow.....	do.....	5,422.98
Robert W. Smart.....	do.....	5,422.98
Agnes H. Johnston.....	Stenographer.....	2,685.48
Rosemary Curry.....	do.....	2,482.74
Gladys Flanagan.....	do.....	2,482.74
Berniece Kallnowski.....	do.....	2,482.74

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$35,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....16,321.92

Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950.....1,499.70

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1949, to Dec. 31, 1950.....17,821.62

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1950.....17,178.38

CARL VINSON,  
Chairman.

#### COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

JANUARY 10, 1951.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Orman S. Fink.....	Professional staff.....	\$4,758.60
John E. Barriere.....	do.....	4,027.59
William J. Hallahan.....	Clerk.....	5,422.98
Elsie L. Gould.....	Assistant clerk.....	3,721.74
Margaret P. Battle.....	Stenographer.....	2,511.69
Helen E. Long.....	Assistant clerk.....	2,406.66

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$25,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....11,710.14

Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950.....480.87

Total amount expended from Oct. 19, 1949, to Dec. 31, 1950.....12,191.01

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1950.....12,808.99

BRENT SPENCE,  
Chairman.

#### COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JANUARY 11, 1951.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive,

together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
William N. McLeod, Jr.	Clerk.....	\$5,422.26
Mabel Haller	Professional staff.....	4,551.31
Ruth Butterworth	Assistant clerk.....	2,424.84
Witmer H. Kelley	Investigator (through Aug. 31, 1950).	1,186.66
Charles D. Farmer	Minority clerk (through Nov. 30, 1950).	3,216.05
Jeanne Richards	Minority clerk (appointed Dec. 1, 1950).	643.33

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$2,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 1,666.95  
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950..... 45.99

Total amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950..... 45.99  
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1950..... 287.06

JOHN L. McMILLAN,  
Chairman.

#### SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE DISTRICT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JANUARY 11, 1951.

##### TO THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Hyman L. Fischback	Professional services as counsel (vouchers submitted for services from Mar. 1 to Sept. 18, 1950).	\$5,000.00
John F. Woog	Investigator (salary) Apr. 1 to Dec. 31, 1950.	4,723.47
P. Gabrielle Tarter	Secretary (salary) July 1 to Sept. 30, 1950.	1,114.62
Helen Horton	Secretary (salary) Nov. 1 to Nov. 30, 1950, expenses.	313.54
Sandy L. Smith	Witness fee.....	6.00
Noble D. Butler	do.....	6.00
Ben Hillman	do.....	6.00
William D. Marrow	do.....	6.00
Winston Sims	do.....	6.00
Robert L. Thompson	do.....	6.00
Samuel Green	do.....	6.00
Elsie G. Menefee	do.....	36.00
House stationery room	do.....	24.30
Hyman L. Fischback	do.....	587.69
P. Gabrielle Tarter	do.....	13.88
Olin E. Teague	do.....	35.26
J. Harry Welch	do.....	33.76

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$30,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 9,997.66  
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950..... 12,237.58

Total amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950..... 12,237.58  
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1950..... 7,759.76

JNO. L. McMILLAN,  
Chairman.

#### COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

JANUARY 12, 1951.

##### TO THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Fred G. Hussey	Chief clerk (July 17 to Dec. 31).	\$4,940.93
John S. Forsythe	General counsel.....	5,422.98
Frank E. Boyer	Investigator.....	5,422.98
John O. Graham	Minority clerk.....	5,422.98
Charles A. Quattlebaum	Research specialist (Oct. 1 to Dec. 31).	636.42
Levi K. Alderman	Research analyst (July 1 to Sept. 6).	1,084.59
Joseph Koski	Chief clerk and executive assistant (July 1 to July 16).	482.03
Mary Pauline Smith	Assistant clerk.....	2,728.92
Mary E. Gilbert Sanders	do.....	2,728.92
Barbara A. White	do.....	2,728.92
Myrtle S. Locher	do.....	2,728.92
Kathryn Kivett	Assistant clerk (Dec. 15 to Dec. 31).	242.56
Frances Los	Assistant clerk (July 1 to July 23).	365.35

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$30,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 22,353.64  
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950..... 5,277.82

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1949, to Dec. 31, 1950..... 27,631.46  
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1950..... 2,368.54

GRAHAM A. BARDEN,  
Chairman.

#### COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

JANUARY 15, 1951.

##### TO THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
William A. Young	Staff director.....	\$5,422.98
Thomas A. Kennedy	General counsel.....	5,422.98
Christine Ray Davis	Chief clerk.....	5,422.98
Martha C. Roland	Assistant chief clerk.....	4,839.29
J. Robert Brown	Research analyst.....	3,859.98
Carl E. Hoffman	Minority counsel, July 1 to Aug. 31, 1950.	1,617.08
Annabell Zue	Minority clerk.....	3,859.98
Dolores Fel'Dotto	Clerk-stenographer.....	3,112.77
Oliver Willeroy	do.....	3,112.77
Teresa Barrett	Clerk-typist.....	1,990.26

Full committee.....	\$2,133.74
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, Congressman HERBERT C. BONNER, chairman.....	3,981.08
Public Accounts Subcommittee, Congressman FRANK KARSTEN, chairman.....	4,410.01
Federal Relations With International Organizations Subcommittee, Congressman HENDERSON LANHAM, chairman.....	5,256.40
Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman.....	13,034.10
Subcommittee Making Inquiry Into Federal Home Loan Bank Board and Related Agencies, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman.....	13,306.58
Government Operations Subcommittee, Congressman PORTER HARDY, JR., chairman.....	31,770.53

Total spent from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950..... 73,892.44

Balance unexpended July 1, 1950..... 141,862.98  
Amount spent from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950..... 73,892.44

Balance unexpended Jan. 1, 1951..... 67,970.54

Expenses of full committee:	
Stationery supplies.....	242.19
Telephone.....	165.35
Plane transportation.....	292.89
Reporting—away from Washington, D. C.	575.85
Congressman CLARE E. HOFFMAN, reimbursement for expenses.....	451.00
Annabell Zue, reimbursement for expenses.....	301.05
Helen M. Boyer, reimbursement for expenses.....	91.55
Miscellaneous expenses.....	13.86
Total.....	2,133.74

Subcommittee Making Inquiry into Federal Home Loan Bank Board and Related Agencies, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman:	
Lyman I. Fischback, special counsel.....	10,000.00
Railroad transportation.....	276.64
Plane transportation.....	917.58
Reporting—away from Washington, D. C.	392.95
Expenses of members of staff.....	1,101.12
Congressman CLARE E. HOFFMAN, reimbursement for expenses.....	118.92
Witness expenses.....	480.69
Miscellaneous expense.....	18.68
Total.....	13,306.58

Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, Congressman HERBERT C. BONNER, chairman:	
Lindsay C. Warren, Jr., clerk, July 1 to Sept. 20, 1950.....	1,142.05
Hilary E. Price, clerk, July 1 to Oct. 31, 1950.....	1,616.52
John H. Small, clerk, Nov. 1 to Dec. 31, 1950.....	1,001.38
Delphine Churko, stenographer, Sept. 7-21, 1950.....	167.96
James A. Chaney, reimbursement for expenses.....	53.17
Total.....	3,981.08

Public Accounts Subcommittee, Congressman FRANK KARSTEN, chairman:	
Harry E. Harper, staff director, July 1 to Nov. 29, 1950.....	3,360.65
Ellis Bernard, clerk-stenographer, July 1 to Oct. 31, 1950.....	1,037.16
Stationery supplies.....	4.35
Telephone.....	7.85
Total.....	4,410.01

Federal Relations with International Organizations Subcommittee, Congressman HENDERSON LANHAM, chairman:	
Franklin D. Rogers, clerk.....	3,100.70
Maisie O. Hudnall, assistant clerk.....	2,062.68
Stationery supplies.....	37.16
Travel expense.....	55.85
Total.....	5,256.40

Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman:	
W. Brooke Graves, staff director, July 1 to Aug. 31, 1950.....	\$1,007.66
Julian Faby, staff member.....	4,551.24
Herbert Roback, staff member.....	4,532.23
Dorothy D. Morrison, clerk.....	2,931.72
Stationery supplies.....	11.25
Total.....	13,034.10



Government Operations Subcommittee,  
Congressman PORTER HARDY, JR., chair-  
man:

Carl H. Monsees, operations analyst.....	4,942.96
Stephen D. Carnes, administrative analyst, July 1 to Sept. 15, 1950.....	1,312.07
John C. Vick, administrative analyst.....	2,015.58
Hester H. Harper, administrative analyst, July 1 to Aug. 31, 1950.....	922.92
Ann F. Cavanagh, administrative analyst.....	1,954.48
Herbert E. Wickenheiser, administrative analyst, July 1 to Aug. 15, 1950.....	606.18
George H. Bowers, Jr., legal analyst, July 1 to Nov. 19, 1950.....	1,839.60
George Miller Rose, administrative analyst, July 1 to Sept. 30, 1950.....	1,716.96
Frances Hardy, research, Sept. 15 to Dec. 31, 1950.....	1,513.2
Herbert H. Trotman, investigator, Oct. 13 to Dec. 31, 1950.....	1,612.75
Mildred H. Lang, stenographer.....	2,015.58
Carlotta Dondero, stenographer.....	1,845.42
Lucille Brooks, stenographer.....	746.36
John H. Dorsey, legal services as special counsel, July 1 to Sept. 7, 1950.....	1,386.00
Gordon Pickett Peyton, legal services as special counsel.....	1,710.97
Stephen D. Carnes, special Adviser, Dec. 1-20, 1950.....	405.28
U. S. General Accounting Office:	
Reimbursement for services of Ralph E. Casey, Sept. 27 to Dec. 31, 1950.....	2,811.64
Reimbursement for services of Robert F. Keller, Sept. 27 to Nov. 15, 1950.....	1,384.74
Stationery supplies.....	109.55
Plane transportation.....	141.62
Railroad transportation.....	342.02
Reimbursement for expenses of members of the subcommittee and members of the staff for July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950.....	391.58
Telephone expense.....	43.05
Total.....	31,770.53

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,  
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

JANUARY 15, 1951.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Boyd Crawford.....	Staff administrator and committee clerk.....	\$5,423.00
Ira E. Bennett.....	Staff consultant.....	5,423.00
Sheldon Z. Kaplan.....	do.....	5,423.00
George Lee Millikan.....	do.....	5,423.00
Jane Nigh.....	Staff assistant.....	2,859.31
Winifred G. Osborne.....	do.....	3,076.57
Doris Leone.....	do.....	2,859.31
Mabel Wofford.....	do.....	2,750.67
Mary G. Chace.....	do.....	3,583.50

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	14,931.81
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950.....	8,238.25
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1949 to Dec. 31, 1950.....	23,170.06
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1950.....	26,829.94

JOHN KEE,  
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

JANUARY 2, 1951.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946,

Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Jeanne McDonagh.....	Clerk Committee on House Administration.....	\$3,034.16
Marjorie Savage.....	Assistant clerk, Committee on House Administration.....	4,413.00
Jack Watson.....	do.....	4,274.76
Lura Cannon.....	do.....	3,004.14
Maureen B. Sandiford.....	do.....	3,004.14
Merle Harris.....	do.....	3,004.14

MARY T. NORTON,  
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

JANUARY 11, 1951.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
CLERICAL STAFF		
Elton J. Layton.....	Clerk.....	\$5,422.98
Glenn R. Ward.....	Assistant clerk.....	3,004.14
Royce Reno.....	do.....	2,569.62
Georgia G. Glasmann.....	Assistant clerk-stenographer.....	2,294.40
Helen A. Griciks.....	do.....	2,207.52
Frances W. Galvin.....	Assistant clerk-stenographer (authorized H. Res. 157).....	2,106.12
Roy P. Wilkinson.....	Assistant clerk.....	1,917.84
PROFESSIONAL STAFF		
Arlin E. Stockburger.....	Aviation and engineering consultant.....	5,422.98
Andrew Stevenson.....	Expert.....	5,422.98
Kurt Borchardt.....	Professional assistant.....	5,422.98
Sam G. Spal.....	Research specialist.....	4,551.24

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (funds authorized under H. Res. 157).....	\$60,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	17,289.40
Amount expended from July 1 to December 31, 1950.....	4,333.33
Total amount expended from January 1, 1949, to December 31, 1950.....	21,622.73
Balance unexpended as of December 31, 1950.....	38,377.27

ROBERT CROSSER,  
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JANUARY 15, 1951.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of

the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Dick, Bess Effrat.....	Chief clerk.....	\$5,422.98
Bernhardt, C. Murray.....	Committee counsel.....	5,422.98
Besterman, Walter M.....	Legislative assistant.....	5,422.98
Foley, William R.....	Committee counsel.....	5,422.98
Lee, Walter R.....	Legislative assistant.....	5,422.98
Smedley, Velma.....	Assistant chief clerk.....	5,422.98
Benn, Violet T. (pursuant to H. Res. 464).....	Clerical assistant.....	3,148.98
Baker, Mabel C.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	2,279.94
Berger, Anne J.....	do.....	2,678.22
Christy, Frances.....	do.....	2,497.20
Hahn, Jane (pursuant to H. Res. 464).....	do.....	2,497.20
Kaslow, Berta.....	do.....	3,859.98
Lamon, Lucile P.....	do.....	2,279.94

1. Funds for preparation of U. S. Code and Revision of the Laws:

A. Preparation of new edition of U. S. Code (no year):

Unexpended balance June 30, 1950.....	\$152,471.91
Expended.....	7,714.44
Balance Dec. 31, 1950.....	144,757.47

B. Revision of the Laws, 1951:

Authorized by Legislative Appropriation Act, 1951.....	12,600.00
Expended.....	5,422.98
Balance December 1950.....	7,177.02

C. Revision of the Laws, 1950:

Unexpended balance June 30, 1950.....	121.86
Expended.....	54.99
Balance Dec. 31, 1950 (to be returned to Treasury).....	66.87

D. Preparation of new edition District of Columbia Code (no year):

Authorized by deficiency appropriation.....	30,000.00
Expended.....	0.00
Balance.....	30,000.00

2. Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure by H. Res. 156, H. Res. 415, and H. Res. 637 (pursuant to H. Res. 137).....

Amount expended.....	\$5,000.00
Amount expended.....	59,909.33
Balance unexpended Dec. 31, 1950.....	25,090.67

3. Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure by H. Res. 246 (pursuant to H. Res. 238).....

Amount expended.....	45,000.00
Amount expended.....	25,320.39
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1950.....	19,679.61

EMANUEL CELLER,  
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

JANUARY 10, 1951.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from

June 30, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John M. Drewry.....	General counsel.....	\$5,422.98
Lynn E. Mote.....	Assistant counsel.....	3,772.70
Reginald S. Losee.....	Chief investigator.....	4,482.12
Gus S. Caras.....	Investigator to minority.....	4,482.12
Frances Still.....	Chief clerk.....	3,859.98
Marie Wilson.....	Secretary.....	3,148.98
Madonna Haworth.....	Assistant clerk.....	3,003.60
Leonard P. Pliska.....	do.....	3,003.60
Total.....		31,176.08

EDW. J. HART,  
Chairman.

#### SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PANAMA CANAL TOLLS

(Pursuant to H. Res. 44, 81st Cong., 1st sess.)  
JANUARY 10, 1951.

##### To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from June 30, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

No additional expenditures have been made since the last report was filed for the 6-month period ending June 30, 1950.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$15,000.00
Total amount expended from Feb. 28, 1949, to Dec. 31, 1950.....	8,061.51
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1950.....	6,938.49

EDW. J. HART,  
Chairman.

#### SPECIAL INVESTIGATING SUBCOMMITTEES OF THE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

(Pursuant to H. Res. 215, 81st Cong., 1st sess.)  
JANUARY 10, 1951.

##### To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from June 30, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles A. Miller.....	Investigator.....	\$4,205.64
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....		\$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....		22,151.33
Amount expended from June 30 to Dec. 31, 1950.....		4,261.99
Total amount expended from June 30, 1949, to Dec. 31, 1950.....		26,413.37
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1950.....		23,586.63

EDW. J. HART,  
Chairman.

#### SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE EXPLOSION AT SOUTH AMBOY, N. J., OF THE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

(Pursuant to H. Res. 643, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)  
JANUARY 10, 1951.

##### To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from June 30, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John J. Rafferty.....	Counsel.....	\$3,172.40
Bernard J. Zinke.....	Investigator.....	2,988.08
Total.....		6,160.48

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$15,000.00
Amount expended from July 19 to Dec. 31 (July 19, 1950, was the date funds were authorized).....	8,671.54
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1950.....	6,328.46

EDW. J. HART,  
Chairman.

#### COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

JANUARY 15, 1951.

##### To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George M. Moore.....	Chief counsel.....	\$5,422.98
Frederick C. Belen.....	Counsel.....	5,422.98
John B. Price.....	Staff assistant.....	3,028.28
Lucy K. Daley.....	Assistant clerk.....	2,883.44
Elayne M. Hoffman.....	Secretary.....	2,521.34
Lillian Hopkins.....	do.....	2,521.34
Ann Hayden.....	Stenographer.....	2,376.50
Pursuant to H. Res. 114, 115, and 472:		
Russell A. Heddeston.....	Staff director.....	4,600.60
Reginald I. Heath.....	Investigator.....	3,684.25
Henry C. Cassel.....	do.....	3,684.25
Jean H. O'Brien.....	Stenographer.....	1,730.97
	Telephone, telegraph, and office supplies.....	233.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	8,514.55
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950.....	13,933.07

Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1950.....	22,447.62
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1950.....	27,552.38

TOM MURRAY,  
Chairman.

#### COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

JANUARY 2, 1951.

##### To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, ap-

proved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
<b>PROFESSIONAL STAFF</b>		
George H. Soule.....	Technical consultant.....	\$5,422.98
Preston E. Peden.....	Counsel.....	4,519.15
<b>CLERICAL STAFF</b>		
Claude E. Ragan.....	Clerk.....	5,422.98
Nancy Arnold.....	do.....	3,721.74
Virginia McMichael.....	do.....	3,004.14
Geraldine Eaker.....	do.....	2,424.78
Betty Lee Angus.....	do.....	2,153.22
Arthur James Brookshire.....	Investigation clerk to committee and chargeable to special fund.....	1,347.10

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$30,000.00
--	-------------

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	13,852.86
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950.....	5,147.09

Total amount expended from Apr. 1, 1949, to Dec. 31, 1950.....	18,999.95
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1950.....	11,000.05

J. HARDIN PETERSON,  
Chairman.

#### COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

JANUARY 3, 1951.

##### To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Joseph H. McGann, Sr.....	Clerk.....	\$4,343.88
Thomas E. Massie.....	Counsel.....	4,243.88
Robert F. McConnell.....	Assistant clerk.....	3,280.82
Joseph H. McGann, Jr.....	do.....	2,786.88
Mrs. Margaret R. Beiter.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	2,786.88
Miss Mary Elizabeth McBee.....	do.....	2,786.88
Mrs. Helen Dooley.....	do.....	2,786.88

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$15,000
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 3, 1951.....	15,000

WILL M. WHITTINGTON,  
Chairman.

#### COMMITTEE ON RULES

DECEMBER 20, 1950.

##### To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive,



together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Humphrey S. Shaw.....	Chief Clerk.....	\$5,380.74
Merritt R. Kotin.....	Assistant clerk.....	4,551.24
T. Howard Dolan.....	Assistant to the clerk.....	3,018.63
Elliodor M. Libonati.....	Clerk.....	3,018.60
Jane W. Snader.....	Minority clerk.....	3,018.60

ADOLPH J. SABATH,  
Chairman.

#### COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

JANUARY 15, 1951.

To the CLERK of the HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1950, to January 1, 1951, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Employees paid by voucher:		
William A. Wheeler.....	Investigator.....	\$4,620.36
Courtney E. Owens.....	do.....	4,343.48
Charles E. McKillips.....	do.....	3,998.22
James A. Andrews.....	do.....	3,101.45
William J. Jones.....	do.....	4,136.46
Alvin Stokes.....	do.....	4,067.28
Lillian Howard.....	Research clerk.....	2,786.88
Helen Mattson.....	do.....	2,931.18
Mary Ann Moffett.....	do.....	2,424.78
Asselia Poore.....	do.....	3,005.76
Blanche McCall.....	do.....	2,279.94
Pearle Gay.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	2,424.78
Sidney Phillips.....	do.....	861.26
Jane Gordon.....	do.....	2,279.94
Helen McCarthy.....	do.....	2,424.78
Lorraine Nichols.....	do.....	2,424.78
Rose Sanko.....	do.....	2,424.78
Ruth Tansill.....	do.....	2,424.78
Virginia McCraw.....	Clerk-typist.....	2,135.16
Alice Cartrell.....	do.....	2,424.78
Lucille Fitzgerald.....	do.....	2,424.78
Catherine Crews.....	do.....	2,424.78
Jo B. Kennedy.....	do.....	2,424.78
Eileen Sonnett.....	do.....	2,279.94
Alice Walker.....	do.....	2,424.78
Gladys Slack.....	do.....	2,279.94
Employees carried on permanent payroll:		
Frank S. Tavenner, Jr.....	Committee counsel.....	5,423.04
Louis J. Russell.....	Senior investigator.....	5,423.04
John W. Carrington.....	Clerk of committee.....	5,242.56
Benjamin Mandel.....	Director of research.....	5,045.04
Donald T. Appell.....	Investigator.....	5,081.22
Ann D. Turner.....	File chief.....	4,067.34
Carolyn Roberts.....	Assistant file chief.....	2,907.62
Rosella A. Purdy.....	Secretary to committee.....	3,438.66
Juliette Joray.....	Secretary to clerk.....	2,714.46
Thelma Seacore.....	Secretary to senior investigator.....	3,148.98

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$350,000.00
Feb. 9, 1949.....	200,000.00
Mar. 23, 1950.....	150,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported Jan. 1, 1949, to July 1, 1950.....	235,881.62
Amount expended from July 1, 1950, to Jan. 1, 1951.....	\$89,040.34

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1949, to Jan. 1, 1951.....	324,921.96
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1951.....	25,078.04

JOHN S. WOOD,  
Chairman.

#### COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

JANUARY 13, 1951.

To the CLERK of the HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from June 30, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Ida Rowan.....	Chief clerk.....	\$5,422.98
Edwin B. Patterson.....	Professional aide.....	5,422.98
Casey M. Jones.....	do.....	5,422.98
Karl Standish.....	do.....	5,422.98
Paul K. Jones.....	Assistant clerk.....	4,551.24
Frances Montanye.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	2,569.62
Mary Schmidt Ponow.....	do.....	404.13
George J. Turner.....	Assistant clerk.....	2,497.20
Alice V. Matthews.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	2,141.35
Noah S. Sweat, Jr.....	Assistant clerk.....	3,148.98

J. E. RANKIN,  
Chairman.

#### COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

JANUARY 13, 1951.

To the CLERK of the HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles W. Davis.....	Clerk (C).....	\$5,422.98
Leo H. Irwin.....	Professional assistant (P).....	3,929.10
Stella O. Miller <sup>1</sup> .....	Assistant clerk (C).....	1,025.52
Harriet B. Lamb.....	Staff assistant (C).....	2,207.52
Doris C. Mickelson.....	do.....	2,159.24
Johnnie Koontz <sup>2</sup> .....	do.....	343.78
Jeannine S. Coble <sup>3</sup> .....	do.....	1,426.35
Gordon Grand, Jr.....	Minority adviser (P).....	5,242.50
Susan Alice Taylor.....	Minority stenographer (C).....	2,377.68
Harry Parker.....	Messenger.....	1,381.92
Sam Hardy <sup>4</sup> .....	do.....	446.60
Esmer Durham <sup>5</sup> .....	do.....	237.57
Rudolph P. Crouch <sup>6</sup> .....	do.....	945.29

<sup>1</sup> From July 1 to Sept. 1, 1950.

<sup>2</sup> From July 1 to Aug. 1, 1950.

<sup>3</sup> From Aug. 22 to Dec. 31, 1950.

<sup>4</sup> From July 1 to Sept. 1, 1950.

<sup>5</sup> From July 1 to Aug. 1, 1950.

<sup>6</sup> From Aug. 24 to Dec. 31, 1950.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$25,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	7,074.32
Total amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950.....	635.59

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1950..... 17,290.09

R. L. DOUGHTON,  
Chairman.

#### SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

DECEMBER 31, 1950.

To the CLERK of the HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, pro-

fession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Walter Adams.....	Economic consultant (July 1 to Nov. 25, various dates).....	\$1,900.00
Jean C. Curtis.....	Research and editorial assistant (Aug. 21 to Dec. 21).....	1,417.17
Victor P. Dalmas.....	Executive director.....	5,422.98
Mildred Deen.....	Stenographer.....	1,979.40
Otis H. Ellis.....	Special counsel for petroleum (July 1 to 15).....	226.20
Richard R. Haas.....	Research assistant.....	1,830.96
Edward Hart.....	Research consultant (Oct. 1 to 15).....	399.43
Joseph W. Kaufman.....	Chief counsel (July 1 to Oct. 31).....	3,615.32
Arthur F. Lucas.....	Economic consultant (July 1 to Dec. 29, various dates).....	2,814.00
Bernard Marcus.....	Investigator (July 28 to Nov. 15).....	1,441.83
Vernon A. Mund.....	Economic consultant (July 1 to Sept. 18, various dates).....	1,675.00
Laverne Maynard.....	Stenographer.....	2,250.96
Bertha A. Padgett.....	Secretary-clerk.....	2,587.71
Kathryn E. Smith.....	Chief clerk (July 1 to Oct. 31).....	1,737.20
Mary Nell Snow.....	Typist.....	1,392.48
M. Elizabeth Soper.....	Stenographer (Aug. 14 to Dec. 31).....	1,437.63
Ernest L. Stockton.....	Research Analyst (Aug. 28 to Dec. 31).....	3,110.01
Emma Trenchi.....	Stenographer (Oct. 16 to 20).....	47.93

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$150,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 90,382.79

Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950..... 37,202.27

Total amount expended from Feb. 2, 1949, to Dec. 31, 1950..... 127,585.06

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1950..... 22,414.94

WRIGHT PATMAN,  
Chairman.

#### SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAM UNDER THE GI BILL

JANUARY 8, 1951.

To the CLERK of the HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from September 22, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
E. R. Ferguson, Jr.....	General counsel.....	\$572.35
George W. Fisher.....	Chief clerk.....	1,878.15
James E. Flannery.....	Research analyst.....	1,393.44
Josephine E. Frick.....	Stenographer.....	1,248.60
Harry Hagney.....	Investigator.....	1,586.00
Arthur Pearlman.....	do.....	1,419.04
George M. Rose.....	Staff member.....	1,755.54
Irene Wade.....	Stenographer.....	1,377.45

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$30,000.00

Amount expended from Sept. 22 to Dec. 31, 1950..... 14,360.48

Total amount expended from Sept. 22 to Dec. 31, 1950..... 14,360.48

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1950..... 15,639.52

OLIN E. TEAGUE,  
Chairman.

# SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE USE OF CHEMICALS IN FOOD PRODUCTS

DECEMBER 31, 1950.

## TO THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from August 21, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Vincent A. Kleinfeld..	Chief counsel (Reimburse U. S. Treasury, Department of Justice).	\$2,836.34
Frances K. Topping..	Staff director.....	2,787.75
Dolores Cook.....	Secretary.....	1,541.19
Franklin C. Bing.....	Consultant WAE.....	723.01
Frank Laspia.....	Clerk.....	53.88

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$35,000.00
Amount expended from Aug. 21 to Dec. 31, 1950.....	15,947.44
Total amount expended from Aug. 21 to Dec. 31, 1950.....	15,947.44
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1950.....	19,052.56

JAMES J. DELANEY,  
Chairman.

## SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 29, 1951

Rev. Nathaniel C. Acton, rector, St. Andrew's Church, College Park, Md., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we beseech Thee to look with favor upon our land and people. All undeserving, Thou hast made us great among the nations of the earth. Let us not forget that this place and this power have come of Thee, and that we have them as a trust to use in Thy service. Save us from pride and arrogance; make us quick to see the needs of those less fortunate than ourselves, and to be resolute in purpose to promote good will and fellowship among all men. Guide, we pray Thee, our President and all those to whom has been committed the government of this Nation, and grant to them special gifts of wisdom and understanding, of counsel and strength; that upholding what is right, and following what is true, they may obey Thy holy will and fulfill Thy divine purpose; for Thine, O God, is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever and ever. Amen.

### ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

HARRY P. CAIN, a Senator from the State of Washington, appeared in his seat today.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 25, 1951, was dispensed with.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

### LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ANDERSON was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate during this week, on official business.

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ELLENDER was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate during this week, on official business to attend conferences between the United States and Mexico regarding agricultural labor contracts, as an observer from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FLANDERS was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today, tomorrow, and Wednesday.

### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Green	Martin
Bennett	Hayden	Morse
Benton	Hennings	Murray
Brewster	Hill	Neely
Brickey	Hoey	Nixon
Butler, Md.	Holland	O'Connor
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Ives	Pastore
Cain	Jenner	Robertson
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Kefauver	Smith, N. C.
Clements	Kerr	Sparkman
Connally	Kilgore	Stennis
Cordon	Langer	Taft
Dirksen	Lehman	Thye
Douglas	Lodge	Tobey
Duff	McCarran	Watkins
Dworshak	McClellan	Welker
Eaton	McFarland	Wherry
Ferguson	McKellar	Wiley
Frear	McMahon	Williams
Fulbright	Malone	Young
George		
Gillette		

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as an observer from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, attending conferences between the Governments of the United States and Mexico regarding agricultural labor contracts.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Michi-

gan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPP] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

## REPORT OF UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 13)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

*To the Congress of the United States:*  
I am transmitting herewith the Sixty-seventh Annual Report of the United States Civil Service Commission. This report covers the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 29, 1951.

(NOTE.—Report accompanied a similar message to House of Representatives.)

### COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to announce that under the rule creating the Committee on Small Business the committee must be appointed at the beginning of each session of each Congress. At the time the committee was created and the Chair made the original appointments, he felt that he had appointed a good committee. He still thinks so, and he reappoints the same members of the committee, and asks the clerk to read the names of the members.

The legislative clerk read the names of Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. McFARLAND, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. LONG, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HUNT, Mr. BENTON, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. THYE, Mr. HENDRICKSON, and Mr. SCHOEPP.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is it in order to make an observation at this time relative to the appointments? I know that we are in the morning hour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. WHERRY. I rise to make only one observation, and that is that the number on the Small Business Committee is 13. I presume that the appointments in the former Congress were based upon the percentage which then prevailed. At that time the ratio was either eight to five or seven to six, to which I did not object at the time, inasmuch as it was a special committee.

In former years the membership of the committee was divided on the basis of an equal number of Members from each